

August 12th, 1964, Morning Session.

CHALCEDONIANS AND MONOPHYSITES AFTER CHALCEDON

By THE REV. PROFESSOR J. MEYENDORFF

The circumstances of the great schism which divided the Eastern Church in connection with the Council of Chalcedon are generally better known than the various efforts which were made later by the Byzantine emperors and the Byzantine Church to heal the schism. As a matter of fact, throughout the sixth and seventh centuries, right until the Arab conquest of the Middle East, the problem of the schism dominated Byzantine religious policy in the East, and many contemporary attitudes of ours find their roots in the positive or negative steps taken in those times. It is relatively easy for us today to appreciate at their real value, the monumental mistakes made, and also the crimes committed, every time that the Emperors tried to solve the dispute by force. For us, today, there is no doubt about the fact that the military repression of Monophysitism in Egypt, and in other places; the imposition of a Chalcedonian hierarchy by Byzantine police; the frequent exile of the real, popular leaders of the Church of Egypt played a decisive role in giving to the schism the character of a national resistance to Byzantine ecclesiastical and political control of Egypt, Syria and Armenia. For centuries, the Orthodox Chalcedonians were considered as "Melchites" — the "people of the Emperor" — by the non-Greek Christians of the Middle East. And Chalcedonian Orthodoxy itself tended, more and more, to identify itself exclusively with the cultural, liturgical and theological tradition of the Church of Constantinople, losing contact and communion with the venerable ancient traditions of Egypt and Syria.

The historical circumstances, which made possible all these mistakes in the past, do not exist any more. No empire is in a position to *impose* union between Monophysites and Dyophysites. No one envisages this union otherwise than through unity of faith, and every opportunity is given to us to settle our difficulties with no other reference than Love and faithfulness to revealed Truth. It is therefore time for all of us to look back on our respective traditions in order to see clearly the *real* issues, to isolate what we

consider as Holy Tradition from all human attachments and prejudices, however venerable they may be, and to recognize that divine Truth may often be expressed in different ways without the unity in Christ being broken.

The purpose of my paper is to examine briefly the *theological* work which was performed by Byzantine theologians in the sixth century in order to meet the Monophysite objections to Chalcedon, and to try to find whether the wisdom of the past could not help us in solving the problems of today.

1. CHALCEDON CHALLENGED

The Great Assembly of 451, which appeared to be by far the most numerous and the most representative of all the previous councils of the Church, was however rejected by large Christian bodies, which stood for a Christology affirming that Christ had *one nature*, and not two. It is to be understood that by the technical term "monophysite" is designated not the Eutychians but all those who, after 451, continued to consider the Cyrilian formula *mia physis tou Theou Logou sesarkomene* as the best way of expressing the Christological mystery, and who accepted the leadership of such prominent theologians as Philoxenos of Mabbug or Severus of Antioch. As modern research has shown, "the monophysite doctrine of the Incarnation, especially in the scientific form which was given to it by Severus, is nothing else than Cyrilian christology."¹ The main concern of the Chalcedonians, who also claimed faithfulness to Cyril, will therefore consist in proving that the definition of 451 is nothing but a new expression of Cyrilism, aimed at answering the problems raised by the Eutychian heresy. The Emperors, interested in reaching a quick and final reconciliation, often pushed this tendency to the extreme, and tried to "forget" Chalcedon completely. The *Henotikon* issued in 482 by Emperor Zeno is the most famous example of these attempts; it did find some acceptance among moderate Monophysites only, and alienated the entire Christian West. The repeated failures of this purely formal and political approach to the problem led the theologians to elaborate a philosophical justification for the Chalcedonian formula, while giving full credit to the central intuition of St. Cyril of Alexandria that Christ was essentially one single *Being*. Thus they found it possible to maintain the validity of

¹ J. Lebon, *Le Monophysisme severien* (Louvain, 1909), p. xxi.

both terminological systems — that of Cyril and that of Chalcedon — on condition that they were not considered as contradictory in their meaning. This tendency found its ultimate expression in the Fifth Ecumenical Council (553) and thus committed the Orthodox Church as a whole. It seems to provide the only possible direction of solving the schism which divides Eastern Christians among themselves since the fifth century.

In general, this tendency, baptized “neo-chalcedonian” by modern critics, is not very popular in the West. We know how difficult it was for Justinian to obtain the endorsement of the Council by Pope Vigilius. And even today many consider the whole development of Byzantine Christology in the time of Justinian as a capitulation before Monophysitism. It is clear, therefore, that the issue is much wider than a simple discovery of a union formula between Dyophysites and Monophysites: it raises the problem of Christology as a whole and touches upon questions arising between Christian East and Christian West, and also those arising within each of them. All this gives to our consultation a broader ecumenical significance, which we must responsibly realize.

The main and essential innovation of the Chalcedonian definition was to apply to Christology the concepts used in the doctrine of the Trinity by the Cappadocian Fathers. In God there are three Persons, or *hypostases*, and one essence, or nature: thus the term *hypostasis* designates the particular and the individual, while “essence” or “nature” indicates the common deity. In Christ, one single Person being both God and man, it is necessary to say that there are two natures in one *hypostasis*.

It is doubtful whether or not the Council was conscious of the difficulties which would soon arise from this necessary terminological innovation. Thus, when John the Grammarian published between 514 and 518 a learned Apology of the Council based upon the Cappadocian terminology, he in fact offered to Severus of Antioch new arguments to justify his opposition to Chalcedon. According to the Council, Christ is “consubstantial (*homoousios*) with the Father according to his Divinity and consubstantial (*homoousios*) with us according to his humanity.” But since the divine substance (*ousia*), according to Athanasius — whose doctrine the Cappadocians admitted by identifying *ousia* and *physis* — is a concrete reality, in a platonic sense (there is indeed *one* God in three *hypostases*), it appeared to many that the Council was affirming the incarnation of the entire Trinity. For the Son

and the Father are but one God. And since Christ is "consubstantial with us" as he is consubstantial with the Father, one should be able to say that he is "one man" with us. On the other hand, is it possible to conceive concretely the humanity of Christ without saying that his human nature is also a human *hypostasis*?

These are the difficulties which prevented the great theologians of sixth century moderate Monophysitism to accept Chalcedon. Thus Severus of Antioch formally distinguishes *ousia* from *physis*, and gives to *ousia* an abstract sense: for him, "essence" is an Aristotelian *deutera ousia*.² He admits in Christ two "essences" (*ousiae*), but united into one single concrete reality, called *hypostasis*, or *physis*, while rejecting the doctrine of the extreme Eutychians or "synousiasts" who considered that there was in Christ one single "essence." It is clear, therefore, that Severus considers the Cappadocian Trinitarian terminology as radically inapplicable to Christology.

Facing his challenge, the Dyophysite theologians will develop a more precise and elaborate conception of *hypostasis*, following a direction which was already initiated by the Cappadocians, and going beyond both Aristotelianism and Platonism. These new precisions will, in fact, lead to new developments in the trinitarian theology itself.

Apollinarius of Laodicea seems to have been first to apply the word *hypostasis* to Christology,³ in order to designate the unity of the Word with the flesh in one single reality. As is well known, Apollinarius was condemned for not recognizing that Christ was fully man, but many of his writings circulated in the fifth century under the pseudonym of St. Athanasius. This led many theologians to ascribe Apollinarian expressions to the great champion of Orthodoxy against Arianism. Cyril was one of the most prominent victims of the forgery; he adopted the expression "unity according to *hypostasis*" as the formula *par excellence* designating the unique being of Christ, and accepted also another obviously Apollinarian expression — "one nature of the Word of God incarnate" — as a subsidiary description of the Christological mys-

² Cf. J. Lebon, *op. cit.*, pp. 354, 376-388.

³ M. Richard, "L'introduction du mot *hypostase* dans la theologie de l'Incarnation," in *Melanges de sciences religieuses*, 2 (1945), pp. 5-32, 243-270.

tery.⁴ The second, only later, became a point of contention between Chalcedonians and Monophysites, while the first was accepted by the Council itself. This acceptance should, in fact, have sufficed to wash away Chalcedon from every accusation of Nestorianism, for *hypostasis* did indeed have, in the fifth century, a strong and concrete meaning. Its adoption by Chalcedon meant a great concession to Cyrillism on the part of both the Westerners and the Antiochians, for it undoubtedly evoked in Antiochian ears the ever-feared Apollinarian confusion of divinity and humanity.

What made their acceptance of the Chalcedonian formula possible was that the formula "two natures" was also included. The Council therefore adopted a system which implied that Christ was really "one" and really "two."

Since their semi-arian past, the Cappadocians were also accustomed to understand *hypostasis* as a concrete reality, and it took a serious effort on their part to accept the Athanasian *homoousios* and to overcome the Arian temptation of completely separating the Father, the Son and the Spirit.⁵ The very originality of their system was that neither *ousia* nor *hypostases* were considered as abstractions and that God was viewed as *really* one and *really* three: this paradox implies, of course, that the categories of Greek philosophy were overcome from inside — even if the terms remained Greek — and justifies the Christological use of the system at Chalcedon.

Thus the notion of *hypostasis* finds itself at the very centre of the Christological debates which followed the great Council of 451; its clarification required all the laborious dialectics of Byzantine theologians striving to reconcile Cyril and Chalcedon. It is difficult to find many exciting figures among them: their manner of handling the issue was often formal and scholastic, and the writings of contemporary Monophysites like Severus and Philoxenus represent much more of the soteriological freshness of the great Alexandrian theology, that of Athanasius and that of Cyril, than the refinements of Byzantine theology cultivated in Constantinople. However, the survival of Dyophysitism in the East is essentially due to the work of Byzantine "grammarians," and also, of course, to the Chalcedonian firmness of the Church of Rome.

⁴ Cf. P. Galtier, "L'unio secundum hypostasim chez saint Cyrille," in *Gregorianum*, XXXIII, 1952, pp. 351-398.

⁵ Cf. G. L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought* (London, 1952), p. 242.

2. LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM

Among the Byzantine theologians of the age of Justinian, Leontius of Byzantium deserves a special mention. His contribution to Christology resides in his doctrine of *hypostasis*, which will later be integrated in the mainstream of Byzantine theology by Maximus the Confessor and John of Damascus.

In his apology of Chalcedon, Leontius was obliged to explain why *hypostasis* and "nature" (*physis*) were no more to be considered as synonymous. If *ousia* and *physis* designate what in Christ is common with the Father on the one hand and with humanity on the other, what is the particular meaning of *hypostasis*? In St. Basil, *hypostasis* was distinct from the "essence" by the respective "peculiarities" of the Father, the Son and the Spirit, while "essence" represented their common Being. The Cappadocian Fathers could also speak of the *hypostasis* as "modes of existence" of the one single divine essence. However, they never considered the *hypostases* as simple expressions of the essence: for St. Gregory of Nazianzus, the *hypostases* "possessed" Divinity (*ta hon he Theotes*); Divinity was "in them" (*ta en hois he Theotes*).⁶ *Hypostasis* is therefore not only a particular and concrete reality, it is the *subject* who possesses and reveals the Being of God. The "hypostatic characteristics" describe it and define it, but they do not constitute it.

The personalistic aspect of the Cappadocian theology is applied by Leontius to christology. From all eternity, Divinity was "in the Son." It was "enhypostasized" in Him. At the Incarnation, humanity also entered "in Him." The Son exists not only as God, but also as man. *Hypostasis* therefore is not only distinct from divine nature but it is capable of assuming another nature. It is not a simple "mode of existence" of a nature, but the very principle of any existence, and, in the case of Christ, the very personal Object of our encounter with the God-Man. *Hypostasis* is that which exists by itself (*kath' heauto*), which designates *somebody* (*ton tina deloi*). Nature is a pure abstraction when it is not "enhypostasized" (*ouk esti physis anhypostatos*); in fact, it is what Leontius calls an *enhypostaton*, a reality which does not exist by itself, but in a *hypostasis*.

Leontius' theology undoubtedly has the appearance of dry

⁶ *Poem. dogm. xx*, 3 P.G. 37, col 414 A; *Hom. 39, 11*, P.G. 36, col. 345 D.

scholasticism, based upon Aristotelian terminology. One must realize, however, that the issue between Chalcedonians and Monophysites was essentially a terminological one, and that it was precisely a terminological elaboration which was needed. And in general one can say that theology, inasmuch as it is a means of communication, must be a science of precision and accuracy And there cannot be any doubt about the fact that Leontius' elaboration of the notion of *hypostasis*, as the personal being and the "being-in-itself," is alone able to secure the possibility of transferring the Cappadocian terminology into Christology.⁷ For if one defines *hypostasis* simply as the *individual* existence of a generic nature, or as the internal expression of an essence, it would be inevitable to recognize in Christ two *hypostases*, two individuals, two persons. This is precisely what Severus of Antioch saw in the Chalcedonian definition, since he refused to distinguish between *hypostasis* and nature. The Chalcedonian Christ thus appeared to him as a synthesis of two distinct beings. On the other hand, the existence in Christ of a distinct human nature signified for Severus that the Son of God had assumed an *individual* of the human race, and not human nature as such. The whole soteriological intuition of Cyril thus seemed to disappear.

However, there cannot be any doubt about the fact that both the Council of Chalcedon and Leontius of Byzantium remain essentially faithful to that intuition. Christ, for them, is *one being*, and this is signified precisely by the notion of *hypostatic union*. *Hypostasis* alone gives reality to both natures, but without destroying their characteristics. They exist in *hypostasis*, but they exist *really*. Divinity and humanity are thus distinct not only "in the mind" (*kata ten epinoian*), as Severus was ready to admit, but in act (*te energeia*),⁸ each preserving its own "energy."⁹ However, their common subject is the same *hypostasis* of the *Logos*, which is not limited by its own nature and can really assume and make hers another nature. The *Logos*, being "in the flesh," possesses the full reality of human life: he is born, he dies, he is

⁷ On Leontius' christology, see A. Theodorou, "Christologike horologia didaskalia Leontiou tou Byzantiou," in *Theologia*, 26 (Athens, 1955), pp. 212-222, 421-435, 584-592; 27 (1956), pp. 32-44. S. Verkhovskoy, "Some Theological Reflexions on Chalcedon," in *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly*, vol. 2, 1958, no. 1, pp. 2-12.

⁸ *Epilysis, P.G.*, 86, col. 1932 C.

⁹ *Contra Nest. et Eutychianos, ibid.*, col. 132 B.

tempted, he is hungry, he is ignorant *as a man*. Thus the notion of hypostatic union leads to the idea of the "communication of idioms"¹⁰ on the one hand, the *Logos* acts according to humanity which He assumed, and, on the other hand, humanity, "enhypostasized" in Him, "becomes itself and through Him the source of all the gifts of the Logos."¹¹ Thus, the human "energy" is assumed by the Logos, and the flesh of Christ, to which all those who are "in Christ" participate, assumes a divine energy, for it is the Logos itself who acts in it. This is the Christological foundation of the patristic doctrine of "participation" and "deification" which will later be further developed in Byzantine theology.

3. THE FIFTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL (553)

A supreme effort of reconciliation with the Monophysites was made during the reign of Justinian and culminated with the Council of 553, which reaffirmed the total faithfulness of the Byzantine Church to the theology of St. Cyril of Alexandria and condemned previous theological writings contradicting him in any way.

We have seen that the doctrine of hypostatic union implied the notion of "*communicatio idiomatum*." Chalcedon itself had incorporated the word *Theotokos* in its Christological definition: this word alone, by reaffirming the decision of Ephesus condemning Nestorius, implied that Christ was one single Person — God the Word — of Whom Mary was the Mother. However, since Chalcedon sounded "Nestorian" in the ears of the Monophysites, in spite of its acceptance of *Theotokos*, it was necessary to accentuate the other implications of the hypostatic union. The so-called "theopaschite" formulae, encouraged by Justinian and formally endorsed by the Council of 553, will tend to this end: these formulae affirmed the notion that God Himself suffered death on the Cross, and not an "assumed man" only "united with God" as Nestorian theology would put it. And indeed, was it not necessary that the Son of God made human death really *His own* in order to destroy it? To speak of the "death of God" seemed, of course, rather shocking, and, strictly speaking, the theopaschite formulae were incomplete as long as it was not specified that this "death of God" could occur only "in the flesh," that is, in Christ's human nature; but they were undoubtedly correct, for a real death could

¹⁰ *Epilysis*, *ibid.*, col. 1945 C, D.

¹¹ *Contra Nest. et Eutychianos*, *ibid.*, col. 1337 A.

only be "somebody's" death: for only *somebody* — a hypostasis, a person — can die, not a nature, and in Christ there was no other person, no other *hypostasis* than that of the Son of God incarnate.¹² To speak of the "death of God" in the flesh was, in fact, not uncommon since the time of Ignatius of Antioch (*Pathos tou Theou*, Rom. 6:3), and the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed itself affirms explicitly our faith in the "Son of God . . . incarnate of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary . . . crucified for us under Pontius Pilate."

Opposition to all forms of the *communicatio idiomatum* and to the theological expressions which implied it — such as *Theotokos*, or "death of God" was, in fact, the essential characteristic of Nestorianism, and their acceptance constituted, in the sixth century, the meeting ground on which Chalcedonians and Monophysites could unite in a common faithfulness to the memory of St. Cyril of Alexandria. For it is on this ground that Cyril had opposed Nestorius, affirming not only that Mary had to be called *Theotokos*, but also that one was obliged to say that "God had tasted death in the flesh" (*thanaton geusamenon sarki*, Anath, 12).

Since Leontius of Byzantium had given the possibility of using these formulae in a non-Apollinarian sense and without contradicting Chalcedon, Justinian accepted them as a criterion of Orthodoxy and as a bridge between the Chalcedonians and the Monophysites. The expression 'One of the Holy Trinity has suffered,' used at first by the so-called Scythian monks, was thus included in the preamble of Justinian's Code Laws (528), in the hymn *Monogenes Huios*, composed by Justinian himself, which became a sort of Christological confession of faith, and was included in the Byzantine liturgy, and in all the doctrinal statements of the time. The formula was accepted even in Rome (534). Its significance is to affirm the unity of Christ's being: Christians recognize only one Saviour, the incarnate Son of God, who was born of a Virgin and died for us, and not two: the Son of God and the man Jesus.

¹² The use of the 'theopaschite' formulae is frequently considered as 'unbearable' by modern Western theologians (cf. for example Ch. Moeller, 'Le Chalcédonisme et le néo-chalcédonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du V^e siècle' in Grillmeier-Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, I, pp. 637-720). They are admitted as self-evident by Orthodox theologians (cf. for example M. Oksiuk, "Teopaskhistskie spory" in *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii*, 1913, 1, pp. 529-559; G. Florovsky, *Vizantiiskie Ottsy*, p. 129). A fresh and more hopeful understanding of the issue is however found in the several works devoted to Cyrillian Christology by F. Diepen.

The *same one* was born of all eternity from the Father, and became, in time, the Son of Mary; *the same* is immortal in His divine nature and died for us according to the flesh.

The clarification of these major Christological issues seemed to bring fruit, and serious hopes for a reunification of Eastern Christendom arose in the beginning of Justinian's reign. The question which remained unsettled was of a rather formal nature and concerned several canonical decisions of the Council of Chalcedon. Thus, at a consultation held in Constantinople in 533, one of the major objections raised against the Council was that it had accepted into the communion of the Church two Antiochene theologians, Theodoret of Cyrus and Ibas of Edessa, who in the past had openly opposed Cyril of Alexandria and rejected the 'theopaschite' formulae. Both were, just as their friend Nestorius, the disciples of the great master of the Antiochene exegetical school, Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose Christology was reputed to be that of two *hypostases* in Christ. Of course, Theodoret had to anathematize Nestorius in Chalcedon, but his writings still included polemics against the great Cyril, whom the Monophysites considered the only safe authority in Christology. Thus the so-called affair of the "Three Chapters" became the issue which would lead to the Fifth Ecumenical Council.

In 544, Justinian published a decree anathematizing each one of the "Three Chapters," that is:

- 1) The person of Theodore of Mopsuestia.
- 2) The writings of Theodoret directed against Cyril of Alexandria and the Council of Ephesus.
- 3) The letter of Ibas to Maris the Persian which presented the reconciliation of 433 between Cyril and the Antiochenes as a capitulation of the latter before the evidence of Antiochene terminology.

Historically, the whole issue of the "Three Chapters" may appear to us as strange in many respects. Was this anathema against men who died in communion with the Church at all necessary? Modern historians, often sympathetic to Nestorianism, generally condemn it as futile and morbid, and consider the policy of Justinian as a capitulation before Monophysitism. It seems to me, however, that both its theological meaning and its "ecumenical" dimension can be of great use to us.

First of all, it is to be noted that the condemnation touched

only those writings of Theodoret and Ibas which opposed Cyril, and supported the thesis that Chalcedon was incompatible with Alexandrian theology: Justinian's policy was based upon the conviction that they *were* compatible and complementary. Justinian thus refrained from condemning the Antiochene school of theology as such, with its essential and, for us, unavoidable insistence on the full reality of Christ's *human* nature and existence. In fact, in Chalcedon, the Council's majority, which was Cyrillian in its doctrinal convictions and theological formation, recognizing the dangers of Eutychian, extreme Monophysitism, had already attempted a reconciliation between Antioch and Alexandria. It admitted the validity of both theologies, by putting them side by side and by providing a tentative, and, in fact improvised, new terminological system of Christology. The theological work done during the age of Justinian, which culminated with the Fifth Ecumenical Council, was in fact a really creative synthesis which showed that Chalcedon and Alexandria, with their somewhat diverging terminologies, could be really *true* only when seen in the light of each other. In spite of its rather turbulent history, its politically unpleasant background and its unusual and formally controversial result — the condemnation of three men who died more than half a century earlier — the Fifth Council appears to be a good example of how the Tradition of the Church shows its real continuity by putting aside mutually excluding elements and by discovering the Truth which is above all questions of personalities.

Justinian's decree of 544, which was intended to settle the matter, soon appeared to be insufficient for a really catholic acceptance of the imperial policy. It was then followed by an imperial Confession of Faith (551) which, in fact, described the agenda of the future Council. While endorsing Chalcedon, vigorously condemning all confusion (*sygchysis*) of natures in Christ, and rejecting the Severian reluctance to "count the number" (*arithmos*) of natures, Justinian proposes Leontius' notion of a "composite hypostasis" (*hypostasis synthetos*), in which and through which the two natures exist and outside of which they are only abstractions. But he gives credit to Severus in admitting that the two natures are to be distinguished not as "two things," but only "in word and in thought" (*logo mono kai theoria*).¹⁸ And finally,

¹⁸ Ed. E. Schwartz, "Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians," in *Ab-*

the imperial Confession proclaims the orthodoxy of the Cyrillian formula "one nature of the Word God incarnate." He writes: "We accept the expression of St. Cyril, . . . for each time that the Father [Cyril] used it, he used the word *nature* instead of the word *hypostasis*."¹⁴

Thus, the difference between Cyril and Chalcedon was, according to Justinian, of a purely verbal nature, and was inevitable by the very fact that *nobody*, in the time of Cyril, saw any formal difference of meaning between *hypostasis* and *physis*.

The Council of 553 itself confirmed this position of Justinian. It rejected vigorously all attempts to interpret Chalcedon in a Nestorian sense.

Anathema 5: "If anyone shall calumniate the Holy Council of Chalcedon, pretending that it made use of this expression [one hypostasis] in this [Nestorian] impious sense, and if he will not recognize rather that the Word of God is united with the flesh hypostatically, and that therefore there is but one hypostasis or one only Person, and that the Holy Council of Chalcedon has professed in this sense the one Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema."

Anathema 14: "If anyone . . . shall presume to defend [Nestorianism, or the Three Chapters] in the name of the Holy Fathers or of the Holy Council of Chalcedon . . . , let him be anathema."

The Council also reiterated forcefully the unity of *subject* in Christ: an issue which was indeed not quite clear in the Antiochene tradition connected with Theodore of Mopsuestia:

Anathema 3: "If anyone shall say that the wonder-working Word of God is one [Person] and the Christ that suffered another; or shall say that God the Word was *with* Christ, born of a woman, or was *in* Him as one person in another, but that he was not one and the same, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, incarnate and made man, and that his miracles and the sufferings which of his own will he endured in the flesh were not of the same [Person], let him be anathema."

"Theopaschism" is endorsed formally by *Anathema 10*:

"If anyone does not confess that our Lord Jesus Christ who

handlungen der Münchener Akad. der Wissenschaften, Neue F. 18 (München, 1939), pp. 72-111; for Severus' position, see J. Lebon, *op. cit.*, pp. 345-368.

¹⁴ *Ed. cit.*, p. 78, lines 5-10.

was crucified in the flesh *is* true God, and the Lord of Glory, and one of the Holy Trinity, let him be anathema."

There cannot be any doubt that the main purpose of the Council was to show that nothing of the Cyrillian position against Nestorius was, in any way, disavowed by Chalcedon. Even the Council of Ephesus, presided over by Cyril himself, did not go as far as confirming everything which Cyril had written against Nestorius. The Fathers of 553 formally proclaimed:

Anathema 13: "If anyone does not anathematize . . . all those who have written contrary to the true faith or against Saint Cyril and his Twelve Chapters . . . let him be anathema."

The "Twelve Chapters" of Cyril were indeed often considered as an extreme Alexandrian position, and their endorsement by the Chalcedonians shows how far they were ready to go to meet their Monophysite brethren. The "Twelve Chapters" of Cyril did not contain, however, the famous formula on "one nature," which was made a sort of symbol by post-Chalcedonian Monophysites. This omission shows, in fact, that Cyril did not at all attribute to it the same importance as did some of his later disciples, and that the expression *one hypostasis*, not *one nature*, was, for him, the standard Christological expression. However, in 553, since a case was made for the formula "one nature," the Byzantine Church, following Justinian's *Confession*, accepted it also, with the reservation that it should not be considered an argument whether *for* Eutyches, or *against* Chalcedon.

Anathema 13: "If anyone uses the expression 'of two natures' [accepted by Cyril, and by Monophysites as Dioscoros and Severus], confessing that a union was made of the Godhead and of the humanity, or the expression 'the one nature of God the Word incarnate,' and shall not so understand those expressions as the Holy Fathers have taught, to wit: that of the divine and human nature there was made an hypostatic union, whereof is one Christ; but from these expressions shall try to introduce one nature or *ousia* [made by mixture] of the Godhead and manhood of Christ; let him be anathema."

It is clear, therefore, that the Council of 553 made its own the entire Christology of St. Cyril of Alexandria, which was based upon the intuition that the Saviour could only be One and that this One is God. To appreciate it fully, it is always necessary to discover this soteriological dimension of Alexandrian theology, which, in the case of Athanasius and Cyril, was not at all a specu-

lation, but the reaffirmation of a Biblical fact, so close also today to Reformed "Neo-Orthodoxy," that *God alone* can save. If it was not God himself, but a man Jesus, only "united with God," who was born of Mary, died and rose again, salvation is not achieved. If it is not God — "One of the Holy Trinity" — who made *his own* our very death, as the last expression of our entire fallen condition, which He came to repair and recuperate, if He is not himself the *subject* of the redemptive act in its entirety, nothing is achieved and, even grammatically, the Nicene Creed is nothing but a misunderstanding, for it affirms that "the Son of God . . . was crucified."

But this Cyrillian theology does have a meaning only if what was assumed by God was the human nature in its full and dynamic entirety. Jesus Christ was fully man in His mind, His soul, in His body; He thought, He felt, He suffered, He ignored, He died, as we do. In nothing of all that are we alone any more, but God is with us. Jesus thus possessed a human nature, but not a human *hypostasis*, because the hypostasis is not an expression of natural existence, but something which gives natural existence a conscious, autonomous, personal reality. This "something" in the man — Jesus — was God the Word, who assumed humanity. Here lies the inevitable and necessary truth of Chalcedon.

As a matter of conclusion, I would like to stress two points. It seems to me that an agreement on these points is a condition of all practical steps towards union between Chalcedonians and Monophysites today . . . and we all believe that such a union is possible since, both in the distant and in the recent past, we seemed to have agreed that the difference between us lies rather in terminology than in theology itself.

1. Theological terminology can only partially, and always somehow inaccurately, express the Truth. It is nothing else than a means of communication, an instrument used by the Church to convey its teaching. This is why the Orthodox is not, and has never been, a "confessional" church. It never accepted to be defined — and therefore limited — by the text of a Confession. Neither the Creed of Nicæa-Constantinople, nor the definitions of the Ecumenical Councils can be considered as defining the fullness of Orthodoxy. If the Creed has acquired a permanent value by its inclusion in the Liturgy, the conciliar definitions are essentially *ad hoc* statements, which can be understood only against the

background of the heresy condemned by them. They do, of course, reflect and witness to an absolute and unchangeable Truth, but this Truth is a living One, which exists in the organic continuity of the One Church of Christ. A Council is ecumenical, and its decision is infallible when it has defined *something* of this permanent and organic Truth, while no human words, and therefore no conciliar definition, can pretend to have exhausted it. Conciliar definitions, while they cannot be simply revoked without the Church ceasing to be Christ's Church, can be complemented and reinterpreted, just as the Fifth Council has complemented and interpreted Chalcedon.

2. Doctrinal statements and definitions are made *necessary* by the life of the Church in history. One cannot avoid them for the simple reason that the human mind is constantly at work, that it constantly searches, and often errs. The function of the Church resides in giving it some guidance: the doctrinal continuity of the Orthodox Tradition is a witness of the presence in the Church of the Spirit of Truth. Thus, the Chalcedonian definition, just as all the definitions which preceded it or followed it, was not necessary in itself, but because there was a concrete danger of the Gospel of Christ being betrayed. This danger came from the heresy of Eutyches, who ceased to see in Christ a human nature totally co-substantial to us. And, in fact, such a heresy was and is present, explicitly or implicitly, in many aspects of Church life, especially in the East, and Chalcedon is a safeguard against it.

It may be that the same danger could and still can be met with other words in another fashion. Let us find it together. The principle has been admitted already in 553, and our effort to achieve unity today may be served by the experience of the Church's past.

DISCUSSION: Concerning the Paper of Father Meyendorff

PROFESSOR ROMANIDES: The impression is created that the term *One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate* became characteristic of the so-called monophysite tradition and was dropped by the Chalcedonians. In fact, it is claimed that the phrase became a basic point of contention. It should be emphasized, however, that this expression of St. Cyril, which is absolutely synonymous with his *one Hypostasis of God the Logos Incarnate*, was accepted by Flavian of Constantinople and Eusebius of Dorelaeum, as well as by the Council of Chalcedon, as is clear from the minutes. The bone of contention between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians was rather

whether after the union of natures in Christ we have *One or Two Natures*. The positions taken depended on whether *Physis* meant *Ousia* or *Hypostasis*.

Also it should be pointed out that *Hypostatic union* for St. Cyril is exactly equivalent to his own *Natural union* and both in turn are equivalent to the term *Essential union* used in the middle of the third century against Paul of Samosata and later by such contemporaries of Apollinaris as St. Gregory the Theologian. It is, therefore, not correct to speak of such a term as though it were introduced into the Church by Apollinarian forgeries.

It is also incorrect to say that Chalcedon abandoned the so-called *theopaschite formula* of St. Cyril's *Twelfth Anathema*, as Western scholars claim or that the Fifth Council brought out this implication of the hypostatic union as though the Fourth Council had not done so, as this paper indicates. Actually, Leo's *Tome* was accepted at Chalcedon only in the light of St. Cyril's *Twelve Chapters*. The so-called *theopaschite formula* is clearly contained even in Leo's *Tome*. Between Chalcedon and the Fifth Council there is no difference on the question of the Twelfth Chapter.

It is my impression that the Chalcedonian distinction between *Hypostasis* and *Physis* was much more accidental than is usually realized. Only during the later polemics was it justified by elaborate theological theories. We must always keep in mind that the Cappadocian Trinitarian distinction between *Ousia* and *Hypostasis* was accepted by the Alexandrians and applied by them to Christology. From this viewpoint talk about Chalcedon's "necessary terminological innovation" tends to ignore this very essential agreement between the Cappadocian and Alexandrian Fathers. Only against this background can one properly appreciate the different uses of the term *Physis*. Thus Chalcedon did not at all innovate, but rather accidentally adopted the Cappadocian use of *Physis* without fully understanding the Alexandrian use of the same term. To speak of any conscious attempt at Chalcedon to reconcile Antiochene and Alexandrian Christologies and terminologies is unrealistic.

Since for Cyril *Physis* and *Hypostasis* are absolutely synonymous it is not correct to claim that Cyril omitted *One Nature* from his Twelve Chapters because he preferred *One Hypostasis* or considered it the standard Christological term. In his Twelve Chapters, as well as in the rest of his Third Letter to Nestorius, Cyril uses the terms *hypostatic union* and *natural union* interchangeably.

FATHER SAMUEL: The term "monophysites" was not used during the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries, but was introduced later in a specific way and in a polemic spirit on behalf of the Chalcedonian Churches. However, one should point out that there is a slight difference between *monos* and *mia* in regard to the two natures—one nature dispute. "Monophysitism" suggests the exclusion of all natures but one. *Mia physis* refers to "one united nature." It should also be remembered that for the non-Chalcedonian side, there are four phrases, namely "from two natures," "hypostatic union," "one incarnate nature of God the Word," and "one composite nature." In fact, the term "monophysite" has been coined by isolating the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word" from the rest and substi-

tuting the word "mia" in it by "monos," a position which the non-Chalcedonian Orthodox Church has never accepted.

BISHOP SARKISSIAN: I can fully agree with the paper. What I found in it does exactly correspond to our understanding of the doctrine of the Person of Christ. However, I am surprised, and I find it extremely significant, that the *Tome of Leo* is not mentioned at all. For us, the non-Chalcedonians, the most poignant and controversial aspect of the Council of Chalcedon has been the acceptance by the Council of the *Tome of Leo* as *regula fidei*. According to our understanding, the *Tome of Leo* has had a distinctive and decisive place and role in the Council of Chalcedon. It is a highly eloquent fact that one of the staunch opponents of the Council of Chalcedon, Timothy Aelurus, in his *Refutation of the Council of Chalcedon*, which has been preserved in its integral text in an Armenian version, argues far more extensively against the *Tome of Leo* than against the Chalcedonian definition. The same has been the case in the Christological and polemical writings of the Armenian theologians.

FATHER FLOROVSKY: I am fully in agreement with Bishop Sarkissian. This was a great omission in the paper. The non-Chalcedonians fought against Chalcedon primarily on account of its acceptance of the *Tome of Leo* which in their eyes was suspicious. Indeed, the *Tome of Leo*, if taken alone by itself, could have created the impression of an excessive opposition of the two natures, especially by its persistent attribution of particular acts of Christ to different natures, without an adequate emphasis on the unity of Christ's Person, although the intention of the Pope himself was sound and orthodox. However, in the interpretation of the *Tome* by Roman Catholic historians and theologians in modern times quite often transpires a certain quasi-Nestorian bias, to which attention has been called recently by some Roman Catholic writers themselves. For that reason it is imperative, in our conversation with the non-Chalcedonians, to clarify our position and to insist on that the *Tome of Leo* should be always used in conjunction with the *horos* of the Council itself.

BISHOP SARKISSIAN: As a matter of fact, it is not only Professor Meyendorff who omitted mention of the *Tome of Leo*. The significant point is that the post-Chalcedonian Byzantine theologians did not comment on it as much as on the Chalcedonian Definition by explaining the latter along the lines of Cyrilian Christology, which brought their interpretation of Chalcedon so near to our Christological position. Is this phenomenon a testimony to the fact that the dualistic character of the *Tome's* Christology did not have any appeal to Byzantine theologians?

PROFESSOR ROMANIDES: In this regard one must keep in mind the fact that Bishop Leo of Rome and his legates presented the *Tome* to the Council of Chalcedon as a statement of faith not only against Eutyches, but against Nestorius also. Because of its obvious Nestorianizing weaknesss it was challenged, debated, carefully examined, and finally accepted only in the light of St. Cyril and again only as a statement of faith against Eutyches, as is clear from both the minutes and the very definition of Chalcedon.

FATHER MEYENDORFF: That is why I think that we should not over-emphasize the importance of the *Tome of Leo* and not regard the silence

of the Byzantine theologians as suspicious. There are many myths around the Council of Chalcedon. We have our myths about the non-Chalcedonians too, but one of your myths is this Tome.

DR. KHELLA: It is not quite a myth on our part. There are other events which prove that the Tome was carefully prepared in the West but with the special intention of securing the approval of the Eastern bishops, and their commitment to a Western formula. Marcian and Pulcheria had been gathering signatures since 450 for the Tome. The idea was to draft a strong paper against the Alexandrian theologians. This was later introduced as a basic paper at Chalcedon.

FATHER ROMANIDES: I am not aware of any historical support for your contention which seems so contrary to the fact that at Chalcedon the bishops of Illyria, Palestine, Egypt, and of the many Roman provinces represented by Anatolius of Constantinople, who all together comprised the overwhelming majority, challenged the Tome, or could accept it only in the light of St. Cyril. Leo's Tome was unconditionally supported only by the bishops of the Oriental Diocese (dioikesis) and the few delegates of Rome.

DR. KHELLA: In the Endemousa Synod of 450 in Constantinople the Tome was brought, read and approved by all present.

FATHER BOROVOVY: I see two parts in the paper of Father Meyendorff: first part, theological; second, conclusions. The second is the most substantial to my mind. I fully agree that it is possible for the Orthodox Church to reformulate her doctrines. She is not bound either by the Tome of Leo or by the Twelve Anathemas of Cyril, or even by the formulation of Cyril.

BISHOP EMILIANOS: I am fully in agreement with Father Borovoy. The Church is never enslaved by terminology which causes misinterpretations and misunderstandings.

FATHER FLOROVSKY: I am also in agreement with the last two paragraphs of the paper, but only in general. Because, on the other hand, we have to be careful not to fall into easy abstractions and generalizations. I am for apophatic theology but its use must be regulated very carefully, and we should never believe that dogmatic terminologies of the past are simply temporary formulations without continuing significance. There cannot be a fruitful discussion on dogmatical differences without careful reference to historical terminology. We are bound to use terms; through these we confess the truth, guided by the Holy Spirit in the Church. We are not imprisoned by terminologies; but we are bound by the spirit, if not the letter, of the Fathers and their understanding of Christian truth.

I do not think that our separation is due only to historical misunderstandings about the terms *physis*, *hypostasis*, *ousia*, *prosopon*, etc. These terms have taken a definite sense in the effort of the whole undivided Church to voice the one truth of the revelation of God. They used the Greek language. Well, Greek is the language of the New Testament. Everything in early Christianity is Greek. We are all Greeks in our thinking as Christians. This is not meant in a narrow nationalistic sense, but as part of our common spiritual and intellectual background. The Fathers worked out an interpretation from which we cannot simply escape. They

had to clothe the event of revelation in understandable language and categories. The difficulty was there right from the beginning, to understand fully these categories and interpret them fully in the realm of soteriology and anthropology. The special difficulty was really to interpret "hypostasis" in regard to the union of the two natures. Chalcedon emphasized the *atreplos*. This implies that in the One hypostasis of the Incarnate Logos humanity was present in its absolute completeness — *teleios anthropos*, although it was the proper humanity of the Logos. The term *physis* is used in the Chalcedonian definition precisely for the purpose to emphasize this "completeness." In fact, *atreplos* and *teleios anthropos* belong indivisibly together. Again, the "complete" human "nature" is free of sin, sin being a reduction of human nature to subhuman condition.

At this point I want to suggest a distinction which I have made already many years ago, in my Russian book, *The Byzantine Fathers*. There are, in fact, two different kinds of dyophysitism — I call them respectively: *symmetrical* and *asymmetrical*. Nestorianism is a symmetrical dyophysitism: there is strict and complete parallelism of two natures which leads inevitably to the duality of *prosopa* or subjects, which may be united only in the unity of function — this is the meaning of the Nestorian *prosopon tes henoseos*, which coordinates the two "natural" *prosopa*. The dyophysitism of Chalcedon is, on the contrary, an asymmetrical dyophysitism: there is but *one hypostasis*, as the subject of all attributions, although the distinction of Divine and human natures is carefully safeguarded. The duality of *prosopa* is emphatically rejected. The crux of the definition is precisely here: *bena kai ton auton*, "Humanity" is included in the Divine hypostasis and exists, as it were, *within this one hypostasis*. There is no symmetry: *two natures*, but *one hypostasis*. The human nature is, as it were, sustained by the Divine hypostasis: *enhypostatos*. Indeed, this *enhypostasia*, as it has been explained in the later Byzantine theology, indicates a different status of Christ's humanity in comparison with the humanity of "ordinary" men — *psiloi anthropoi*. It is humanity of the Logos. Yet, in its character it is "consubstantial" with the humanity of men. But Christ is *not a man*, although *kata ten anthropoteta* He is *homoousios hemin*. The "status" of His humanity, however, is different from ours: *choris hamartias*. This has a decisive soteriological significance: Christ was exempt from the inevitability of death, and consequently His death was a voluntary death, or free sacrifice. It would be out of place to develop this idea now any longer. But it may be helpful to say a word or two on the Christological significance of our conception of Sin, in its relation to human "nature." Again, one may distinguish two basic conceptions of man, which I use to denote as *anthropological maximalism* and *anthropological minimalism*. The obvious instances are: Pelagius, on the one hand, and Augustine, on the other. The "high" conception of man leads inevitably to *low Christology*: man needs but a pattern of perfection and example to follow. This is precisely the line of Nestorius. On the other hand, a pessimistic anthropology requires a "maximalist" Christology. In this case man needs, in the phrase of St. Gregory of Nazianzus, "God Incarnate" as his Saviour.

Here, I have to offer the solution that I suggested in a paper published

only in Russia several years ago. One has to speak of symmetrical and asymmetrical dyophysitism. The *symmetrical*, consistent with the formula true God and true man, accepts that ontologically there is an equal share of divinity and humanity in the one hypostasis of Christ, but further it accepts that there is an ontological identification of the humanity of Christ with humanity in general. This can lead to a crypto-Nestorian distinction or even separation of two persons. Well, can you say that Christ was of two hypostases? This can lead to a maximalist conception of man which can result in a maximalist conception of the incarnation.

Chalcedon was clearly for *asymmetrical* dyophysitism. The humanity of Christ is proper to the humanity that the Divine Logos fully and *atrepitos* assumed. There is, however, a certain dissimilarity between humanity in general and the humanity of Christ as the Divine Logos, because this humanity is sinless and incorruptible. You can say that Christ was free from the necessity to die. The Augustinian position seems not to pay so much attention to this dissimilarity and the monophysites risk also keeping this dissimilarity in a consistent way by slipping to the position of absolute ontological consubstantiality which denies in Christ the full qualities of humanity in general.

ARCHBISHOP TIRAN: I am fully in agreement with Father Florovsky concerning our common Greek heritage and background in theology. I have no patience with those who accuse the non-Chalcedonians of not understanding the Greek language and terminology. After all, the split over the Council of Chalcedon took place primarily among Greeks themselves and the non-Greek sections of the Church took sides with one or other Greek faction. Armenian theologians of the period under consideration spoke and wrote Greek as well as the Greeks themselves, to the degree that some sixth century Armenian writers cannot even be understood without reference to Greek grammar and vocabulary.

With regard to Father Florovsky's reference to New Testament terminology, I think we must bear in mind the fact that the Holy Scriptures could have no theological formulations that could help us in our problem. The Scriptures deal with existential situations and realities and our terms could only be interpretive of the truths conveyed by the Scriptures.

Thirdly, I am not sure that patristic anthropology has dealt sufficiently with the problem of man's nature. Some of the confusion that arose during the Christological controversies, it seems to me, was due to this fact. When the Fathers speak of the human nature of Christ, they do not seem to be clear about the nature of man himself.

FATHER SAMUEL: It is true that, as Father Florovsky has shown, a certain type of theopaschite emphasis is conserved in the Chalcedonian tradition. It should be remembered, however, that on this point the non-Chalcedonian side had led the way. In the fourth quarter of the fifth century, when under Peter the Fuller of Antioch the *Trisagion* was expanded to include the words "Thou who wast crucified for us," the Chalcedonian side opposed it. In fact, this phrase was introduced into Constantinople by Timothy of Constantinople during the days of emperor Anastasius and again there was opposition to it from the Chalcedonian side.

It was only later, by insisting on "One of the Trinity suffered," that the Chalcedonian side began to speak of God *nekroumenos*.

The non-Chalcedonian emphasis with reference to anthropology and soteriology is briefly this. Man is a created being, created by God out of nothing. But by his disobedience, he became a fallen creature. So God the Son became incarnate in order to redeem man by uniting to Himself hypostatically manhood in its fullness. This union is a mystery, which human language is incapable of describing. But we believe that the manhood so united to Himself by God the Son is preserved without diminution.

FATHER MEYENDORFF: It is clear that our difficulty lies only in interpreting *physis* and *hypostasis*. For my part, I would say that Chalcedon's main work was to distinguish between these two terms. After Chalcedon, hypostasis was used to denote a concrete reality, and a personal entity; it makes it possible to look at Christ as a composite (*synthetos*) nature in *one* hypostasis. This terminology provides the Church with a means of expressing both the duality and the concrete unity of Christ. However, since every terminology is always conventional, the Orthodox Church has not excluded the possibility of using the old, pre-Chalcedonian terminology also, provided that it conveys the same meaning. Neither the Tome of Leo, nor the Twelve Anathemas of Cyril, nor the Chalcedonian definition itself are isolated documents: they must all be considered in the light of the entire Tradition of the Church.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

APPENDIX

THE DOCTRINE OF THE UNION OF THE TWO NATURES IN CHRIST

A THEOLOGICAL VIEW

By ARCHBISHOP MAR SEVERIUS ZAKKA IWAS OF MOSUL

The Churches which teach the two natures of Christ are confessing in theory the unity of those two natures. In practice they distinguish between the two natures, because they ascribe certain actions to the humanity of Christ and others to His divinity. As Leo wrote in his Tome: "Christ really has two natures, He is both God and man; the one performs miracles, and the other accepts suffering." One author wrote: "Our Church confesses that everything which is characteristic of the Godhead and everything which is characteristic of man is to be ascribed without distinction to the incarnate Word; in this dogma it (the Church) has proofs from Holy Scripture, both logical and historical, and the testimony of others."

The same author asks: "What is nature and what is kenoma (person), and what is meant by economic natural union?"

The philosophers defined nature as follows: Nature is the designation of the "What" of things (i.e. their essence and their object). If we speak in this way of the nature of God, then we mean God Himself. But the kenoma (person) is a designation of the origin (Entstehung) of the thing itself. In other words: the kenoma is a spiritual essence, personal in nature, conceivable as associated with many others. This means that it is the kenoma which distinguishes persons from each other. The kenoma distinguishes Peter from Paul, and Paul from John.

The theologian Mar Gregorius Mar-Hebraeus says in his theological encyclopedia: "Ecclesiastics or theologians agree with us; every essence is a nature, and a nature is an essence, for in our opinion nature is not perceptible through the symptoms, but the symptoms arise from the nature. The heretics, however, say that every being is a nature, but that every nature is not a being. For the symptoms themselves differ from one another in their nature. And nature (according to our view, and to that of the heretics) is either a general or a special one. The special nature is therefore called kenoma. For it is impossible for a nature to

exist without kenoma, merely in existence. But it is not impossible for many kenomas to exist in a general nature, within which they are placed together."

Bishop Isidorus says: "Nature, in analogy to the abstract creation, or to the concrete one, generalizes and specializes. When it generalizes, it includes all the individual examples of the same type, e.g. Peter, Paul and John are all men, the horse, the lion, the donkey and the cat are all animals, and Michael and Gabriel are both spirits. On the other hand, when it specializes it consists only of one example of the type, e.g. Peter as one example of a man, the horse as one example of an animal, and Michael as one example of the abstract."

Another writer says: "Where being exists, there exist with it also the special and the general. In the case of the special, the being includes only one kenoma; in the case of the general, the being included many kenomas (persons)."

The same writer says: "The self (person) or nature or being in the special case is the kenoma, or person. It is therefore impossible for being, or nature or self, to exist without kenoma, except in the sphere of ratio."

WHAT DOES "UNION" MEAN?

Generally speaking, union is the merging of two or more things into one. But in theology "union" is the combination (without alteration in nature) of beings, which are united without any change or modification occurring in their own nature. The union between the soul and the body does not lead to any fusion or mixing, like the union of fire with iron, or of electricity with the filament of the light-bulb.

Both the soul and the body retain their own nature when they are united. For example, if the soul had become flesh, then it would lose the ability to speak and to think rationally and all the other functions which are characteristic of it, it would become like an animal and when it died it would become dust. And if the body had become a soul, then it would not need to eat or drink. But as it is, each retains its own quality.

In its union with the material body the abstract soul exercised its influence on the flesh, but was not influenced by it; the soul imparts its life to the body and raises it above the nature of the animals, by giving man "ratio" and speech. For man consists of

two essences or beings: one animal and earthly, the other heavenly. In man they become united in one existence, one essence or being. Everything that happens to one part of this single existence (which is composed of two parts) happens to the whole; although some of these occurrences are experienced only by the soul and others only by the body, i.e. only by one of the parts of which the whole existence is composed. But because man is a composite being made up by union of two parts, then everything that happens to one part affects the whole and all the parts. So we can say, for instance, that John ate or drank or slept, or that Salim was an architect or a lawyer or was dead or alive.

St. Cyril of Alexandria said: "As an example of the union of the Godhead with humanity let us take the union of fire with iron. Although their natures are different, through their union they become one nature. Not because the nature of the fire is changed and become iron; nor because the nature of the iron is changed and become fire. But fire is united with iron. It is fire and it is iron . . . if the iron is struck, then the fire is struck also. The iron suffers, but the fire does not suffer."

Also in this letter to the Bishop of Caesarea, he said: "Let us take an example from our own human nature. Because we are created of soul and body, and they are not two separate natures before their union, and with their union they become a man with a nature, the soul is not changed in its nature because of its union with the flesh. The soul has not become flesh, and the flesh has not become soul; but the soul and the flesh together have become one nature and one man."

So we understand the union of humanity and divinity in the one Christ, as the Bible says and the Holy Fathers taught, and as pure reason can understand and believe. And it is impossible that we speak of two natures after their union. For after the union of the Godhead with humanity, the duality between the two natures ceased to exist. Just as in the union between the soul and the flesh in a man, after the union mention was made not of a speaking soul but of a speaking animal. And we find no clearer example than those we have just mentioned, in order to explain the union of the abstract Word with concrete manhood. For after the union we do not speak of the man and of God, nor of God and of man, but of the man-God or of the God-man, and of the Biblical expression "the incarnate Word" or "the Word become Man."



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

THE ESSENCE OF ORTHODOX ICONOGRAPHY

By CONSTANTINE D. KALOKYRIS

CHAPTER TWO

THE FORM OF ORTHODOX ICONOGRAPHY

«Ο ἀπερίγραπτος Λόγος τοῦ Πατρός . . . περιεγράφη σαρκούμενος, καὶ τὴν φυτωθεῖσαν εἰκόνα εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἀναμορφώσας τῷ θείῳ κάλλει συγκατέμιξεν».

"The uncircumscribed Logos of the Father was circumscribed by being incarnate, and by transforming the darkened image in the original, He united it with the divine beauty."

(Kontakion of Sunday of Orthodoxy)

The particular form of Orthodox iconography is especially interesting not only in itself, but also for the whole understanding of this art's content. Matter and form, that is, content and style are here in such relationship that the one interprets the other and both together interpret the real essence of Orthodox iconography. The research into this form, therefore, is a very important subject; its ignorance during the past centuries has led to misinterpretation and to its neglect by many. A consequence of this neglect is undoubtedly the lack of emphasis in contemporary Orthodox worship of the primarily liturgical significance of this art. This means the deprivation of worship of a fundamental element, an element especially contributive to the expression of its strong power and its incomparable spiritual superiority — as indicated by its long tradition.

Before we proceed to the examination of the particular elements constituting this form of iconography, it is necessary to see the more general presuppositions which led to it.

A. MORE GENERAL PRESUPPOSITIONS OF FORM IN ORTHODOX ICONOGRAPHY

The knowledge of the reasons dictating the particular form which Orthodox iconography utilized is necessary precisely because it is such ignorance which often compares the form of this art with the religious art of the West and, as a result, condemns the Byzantine form as being erroneous, primitive, unnatural, and other such things. Western art is admired for rendering the power of naturalism, of presenting real physiognomies and environment,

while Byzantine art is criticized for its weakness in rendering natural reality, natural beauty, grace and variety. But it is precisely in this negative verification that the value of Byzantine art lies, and it is this point which concerns its entire particular form.

We have already seen that the content of Orthodox iconography became the *καινὴ κτίσις* ("new creation") in Christ. The high theology of this new creation in Christ and the actual life-experience in worship of its revelation concentrated the entire interest of this art. The common world, the world of decay was wholly unrelated to it. The *ουπωθεῖσα εἰκὼν* (darkened or unclean image) of the world and of man, which resulted from the *πτώσις* (the fall),¹ was contrasted by the Church to the image of the world² and of man which was renewed by the *ὑπερπερισσεύσασαν* (over-abundant) Grace.³ In order, therefore, for Orthodox art to be able to express this work of Grace, which the Church proclaims, it was necessary that even its form be analogous. For this reason, the iconographies which aimed at expressing the holiness of the persons could not have been mere portraits, that is, pictures which direct us to natural people. Rather they had to be creations of a particular morphological conception which dismiss the spectator from the transience of this world and impose upon him the idea of the reborn creation, of the eternal world of the Kingdom of God.

A basic presupposition of the form, therefore, was this idea of a "new" man and world in Christ. The Sacred Scripture, the Fathers of the Church and the Ecumenical Councils formulated and developed this idea and presented it to the Church. The art was obligated from the beginning to follow and to *μορφώσῃ* (formulate, fashion)⁴ this idea, that is, this fundamental belief of the

¹ Οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει ἕχοι τοῦ νῦν (for we know that all creation bemoans and travails together (with man) until now), Rom. 8:22.

² Ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς (for that creation also will be liberated from the bondage of corruption . . .), Rom. 8:21.

³ Rom. 5:20.

⁴ Regarding this "morphosis" in the ecclesiastical sense and the recent movement to promote it, see the exceptional and fully informative studies of Evangelos Theodorou, *'Η Λειτουργικὴ Μόρφωσις καὶ Ἀγωγὴ* (The Liturgical Instruction and Education), Athens, 1958, p. 11 f., and *'Η Μορφωτικὴ Ἀξία τοῦ Ἰσχύοντος Τερψίδου* (The Instructive Value of the Triodeon in Use). Athens, 1958, pp. 69 f.

Church. Thus, the art form was subordinated to the authority of the Church;⁵ it became its property and only the technical part was made the concern of the iconographers.⁶ The Seventh Ecumenical Council decided that τῶν ζωγράφων ἐφεύρεσις ἡ τῶν εἰκόνων ποίησις, ἀλλὰ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἔγκριτος θεομοφεσία καὶ παράδοσις, τοῦ ζωγράφου ἡ τέχνη μόνον, ἡ δὲ διάταξις τῶν δειμαρένων ἀγίων πατέρων. (the invention of the painters is the icon's creation, but the distinguished institution and tradition belongs to the catholic Church. For to the painter belongs the art only, while the order of fundamentals belongs to the holy Fathers).⁷ By contrast, in the West, from the council of Frankfurt (794), no dogmatic-theological or liturgical significance was attributed to art; it was regarded simply as an element "for the decoration of the churches."^{7a} This is the reason why it was left free and uncontrolled in the hands, the subjective ideas and the mentality of irresponsible painters.

Orthodox iconography, however, directed and guarded by the Church, gave the appropriate form to its creed. According to the Church, the form of Christ was not to be represented as any natural man's. If Christ were pictured as an ordinary mature man (as is done in the West), it would infer the idea of His one nature, the human only; this would be a kind of nestorianism and as such dangerous to Orthodoxy. Christ, however, is God-Man, διπλοῦς τὴν φύσιν (double in nature). Now, art had to find some form, some iconographic type which would lead the spectator directly to the thought that in the represented person κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς, (dwells the whole fullness of the divinity bodily).⁸ Moreover, according to Theodore Studites, ἃν τε φαίημεν τὸν Χριστὸν Θεοῦ δύναμιν καὶ Θεοῦ σοφίαν, ὥσαύτως καὶ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἀπεικόνισμα Θεοῦ δύναμις καὶ Θεοῦ σοφία εἰρηται, (if we say that Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God, by the same manner His representation must be said to be the

⁵ Cf. also A. Grabar (Skira), *La peinture byzantine*, p. 34.

⁶ See also *Encyclopédie Populaire des Connaissances Liturgiques* (Paris, Bloud et Gay, 1947, pp. 213 f.

⁷ Mansi, *Sacr. Cons. nova et empl. collectio*, XIII, p. 252.

^{7a} See Ch. J. Héfélée, *Histoire des Conciles*, III 2 (Paris, 1907-10), pp. 1067 f.

⁸ Colossians 2:9, But which Western picture of the Lord imposes the idea that in the represented Christ dwells the whole fullness of divinity bodily?

power and the wisdom of God.)^{8a} This presupposition directed the inspiration of the Orthodox iconographers to that morphologically ideal type, by which — as far as it is possible to art — they represented the *Person* of the Lord Jesus Christ, of God the Logos, granted that in His person the two natures are united without confusion and change. The humanly "beautiful" Christs of Western art, or those purely human types influenced by them, are dogmatically reprehensible and, therefore, unacceptable for us since they denote the idea of only the human nature of the Lord. The decision of the Seventh Ecumenical Council stated that the Church, even though she may depict the Lord through art in His human form, does not separate in the representation Christ's flesh from His divinity, since it is united in Him and, is δύοθεος καὶ δύοτιμος (co-divine and of equal honor).⁹ Christ is, therefore, represented in Orthodox art as *God-Man* (*theanthropos*), the divinity being alluded to in the representation of His holy Body (which is always referred to the hypostatic union of the two natures); this again is indicated by the hymn-writer who, being filled with much adoration (from the idea of divinity that such an icon denotes), writes the following: Ποίοις οἱ γηγενεῖς δόμμασιν, ἐποψώμενά σου τὴν εἰκόνα; ήν τὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων στρατεύματα βλέπειν ἀδεῶς οὐδὲ δεδύνηται, θεῖκῷ φωτὶ ἀστραπτομένην . . . (With what eyes shall we creatures of earth see thine image? The image which the armies of angels cannot see without fear as it shines in divine light?)¹⁰

^{8a} Migne, P.G. 99, 361.

⁹ Mansi, *Sacr. novæ et ampl. collectio* XIII, 344. For the δύοθεον καὶ δύοτιμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ σάρκα (co-divine and co-honorable body of Christ) see also the synodical Letter of the Seventh Ecumenical Council for Orthodoxy, in *Triodeon*, ed. Apostolici Diaconia of the Church of Greece, Athens, 1960, p. 147. See also p. 148: Τῶν λεγόντων δτὶ ή σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου ἔξ αὐτῆς ἐνώσεως ὑπερψυχθεῖσα καὶ ἀνωτάτῳ πάσοις τιμῆς ὑπερκειμένη, ἔξ ακρας ἐνώσεως δύοθεος γενομένη, ἀμεταβλήτως . . . ἀναλλοιώτως μένουσα τῷ προσλαμβανομένῳ αὐτὴν Θεῷ Λόγῳ . . . αἰωνίᾳ ή μνήμῃ, (May the memory be eternal of those who say that the flesh of Christ was over-exalted by its union and is found beyond the highest honor, being equally divine by utter union, and remaining immutably and invariably with the Divine Logos who received it). Also, according to Theodore Studites: ἐμίχθη τὰ ἄμικτα, ἐν τῷ ἀπεριγράπτῳ τὸ περιγραμμένον, (the unmixable were mingled; in the uninscribable, the inscribed), Migne, P.G. 99, 409 C.

¹⁰ *Menaios*, August 16 (In the Psalm "Lord I cry unto Thee").

Of course, Christ as God, as the ἀπερίγραπτος Λόγος τοῦ Πατρὸς (the uncircumscribed Logos of the Father) is even for art ἀπαράστατος (unrepresentable). Moreover, Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἔώρακε πάποτε (no one has ever seen God) (John 1:18). But once the Son καὶ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (and Saviour Jesus Christ) (Titus 2:13), δῶν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς (who is over all, God . . .) (Rom. 9:5), ἀσαρκος δῶν ἀσαρκῶθη ἐκών, καὶ γέγονεν δὲ οὐκ ἦν δι' ἡμᾶς (was willingly incarnated, being unincarnate, and became what he was not, for us), that is, He μετέσχε τοῦ ἡμετέρου φυσάματος, (partook of our nature)¹² by utter condescension, and became circumscribable and therefore necessarily representable. With the reception of the flesh προσέλαβε καὶ τὰ ἴδιώματα αὐτῆς ἀπαντά (He also received all of its attributes) in which, of course, the circumscribable is founded.¹³ Theodore Studites noted also: ἐσχηματίσθη δὲ ὁ ἀσημάτιστος· καὶ δὲ ποσός εἰσω ποσότητος ἐγεγόνει, (the unformed received form, and the one of no quantity has become equal to quantity).¹⁴ Since, therefore, ἐαυτὸν δὲ ὁρατὸς ὄρατὸν παρεσκεύασεν, (the invisible one made himself visible)¹⁵ through the incarnation and thusly ἐωράκαμεν τοῖς ὄφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν (we have seen with our eyes) His face and ἐθεασάμεθα καὶ οἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν (we have seen and our hands have touched),¹⁶ we became, consequently, capable of τὸ εἶδος τὸ τῆς ἐμφερείας αὐτοῦ ἐγγράφειν, (inscribing the form of His resemblance).¹⁷ For this reason,

¹¹ *Triodeon*, op. cit., p. 137.

¹² *Menaion*, December 25 (ed. Venice, 1890), p. 197.

¹³ *Triodeon*, p. 134: Φύσει ἀπερίγραπτος, τῇ θειᾷ σου ὑπάρχων, ἐπ' ἐσχότων Δέσποτα σαρκωθεὶς ἡξίωσας περιγράφεσθαι, (Being in Thy divine nature indescribable Lord, in these last days Thou deemed it worthy to be circumscribed).

¹⁴ Migne, P.G. 99, 413 C.

¹⁵ E. Schwarz, *Acta concil. oecum. consil. univers. Chalcedonese*, I, 1, p. 13.

¹⁶ I John 1:1-2.

¹⁷ *Triodeon*, p. 134. Cf. also the hymn: 'Ο δένω τοῖς Χερουσθιμ δῶν ἀθεώρητος ὄραται διὰ γραφῆς οἰστερὸς δμοιώται . . . (He who is above unobserved by the Cherubim is seen in the representation of those to whom He was assimilated) (*Menaion*, August 16). Moreover, in agreement with the words of Christ: δὲ ἔωρακός ἐμὲ ἔώρακε τὸν Πατέρα (he who has seen me has seen the Father) (John 14:9); ἐγὼ καὶ δὲ Πατήρ ἐν ἐσμεν (I and the Father are one), and with the teaching of the Church about the son as ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ (consubstantial with the Father) etc., it is necessary to note also God the Father in the icons of the Son in Orthodox iconography, such as, for example, the type of the Pantocrator. And

since then, the Orthodox Ἐκκλησία, τὴν ἔνσωμον εἰκόνα τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὃς ὑπεροχόσιον κόσμον ἐπαμφιέννυται, (Church is redecorated in the bodily icon of Christ which is as a beauty beyond this world),¹⁸ and through which her iconography seeks the μόρφωσιν τῆς σαρκώσεως τοῦ Δεσπότου τῶν ὅλων, τῶν παθημάτων, (representation of the incarnation of the Lord of all, of His sufferings),¹⁹ and of the other events of His life.

These dogmatic presuppositions of the form of iconography (which the West never took into account) are extended certainly to the person of the Theotokos and to the Saints. Orthodox iconography formulated the icon of the Mother of God by an iconographic type which does not depict her as a woman of a usually normal naturalistic form, but rather indicates her *all-holiness* and

this is especially true since each person of the tri-hypostatic and indivisible Divinity (and in this case the Son) is at the same time the bearer of the divine essence and power and also the whole God. Cf. Ch. Androutsos, Δογματικὴ (Dogmatics), pp. 39-92. See also John Damascene, *First Oration about Icons*, Migne, P.G. 94, 1240: εἰκὼν τοίνυν ζῶσα, φυσικὴ καὶ ἀταράλλακτος τοῦ ἀοράτου Θεοῦ, ὁ Τίος, ὅλον ἐν ἑαυτῷ φέρων τὸν Πατέρα, κατὰ πάντα ἔχων τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ταυτότητα, (therefore, a living image, natural and unchangeable of the invisible God is the Son, bearing in himself the whole Father and possessing in everything identity with Him). But the representation of God the Father (especially together with the other two Persons of the Holy Trinity) began to be known in Byzantine art from the 11th century. Thus, we have God the Father, but as the παλαιὸν τῶν ἡμερῶν (the ancient-one of days) in a wall-painting of San Biagio in Brindisi, and in the codex Paris. gr. 1208 of the National Library in Paris, dated in the 12th century (Grabar, *La peinture byzantine*, p. 183). With the Son and the Holy Spirit (Holy Trinity) we have Him in the codex Suppl. gr. 22 of Vienna (see Gestinger, *Die griechische Buchmalerei*, Wien, 1926, p. 34, illustr. XVIII). In the 13th century we find Him in the same representation of the codex 524 in the Library of San Marco of Venice (see *New Hellenomnemon*, p. 6). In the 14th century we find Him in the Psalter of Munich (see edition of Strzygowski, illustr. XXXVII) and later in the wall-paintings and the panel icons. Thus, in the beginning, God the Father appeared as the "Ancient of Days" (Daniel 7:9) and after, He was represented together with the two other Persons of the Holy Trinity by a personification in an icon of the Holy Trinity, which became popular from the 14th century. (About the old type of the Holy Trinity in the representation of the Hospitality of Abraham see my study *The Byzantine Wall-paintings of Crete*, p. 96.

¹⁸ *Triodeon*, (Glory Hymn: "The Grace has shown . . ."), p. 134.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 142.

leads one to the great Mystery which was accomplished through her. According to the Patriarch Germanos: Τῆς κατὰ σάρκα ὀχθάντου αὐτοῦ (τοῦ Χριστοῦ) Μητρός, τῆς ἀγίας Θεοτόκου . . . τὴν δύμοιωσιν ἀνιστοροῦμεν, δεικνύοντες ὅτι τὸν Θεὸν τὸν ἀόρατον καὶ τὰ πάντα τῇ χειρὶ, περιέποντα ἐν τῇ ἔαυτῃ συνέλαβε γαστρὶ καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς σαρκωθεὶς ἀπεκύνησε, (We picture the likeness of His (Christ's) pure Mother according to the flesh, the holy Theotokos . . . by indicating (that is, by the form of this iconography) that she conceived in her womb the invisible God who tends diligently to all things with His hand, and who, being made incarnate by her, was brought forth).²⁰ Therefore, by the "form" of the Theotokos the Orthodox iconography seeks to indicate directly the dogma of the Incarnation and not simply to present to us the simple virgin of Nazareth before the Πνεῦμα Ἀγιον καὶ δύναμις Τύποντος (Holy Spirit and power from the Highest) came to overshadow her²¹ and to make her thus *the Virgin* and *truly the Mother of God*. Unfortunately, the painters of the Virgin in the West persisted in a virgin of Nazareth before the Grace.²² Thus, Roman Catholics continue even today to portray her as such, even though one would expect that their recent dogma (1854) of the Immaculate Conception would influence them to formulate a more spiritual type for the Virgin Mary.²³

The teaching of the Church appears most creative also in the entire formation of the iconographic types of the Saints. The Saints and Martyrs lived the "new" life in Christ, they struggled in the present life, and achieved the ἄφθαρτον στέφος (incorruptible crown) of the heavenly life. Each one of them became a type of the regeneration in Christ, an icon which Christ εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἀναμορφώσας τῷ θείῳ κάλλει συγκατέμιξεν, (reformed in the

²⁰ Migne, P.G. 98, 157 C. But what western icon of the Theotokos proves by its form the great Mystery of the Incarnation of God the Logos, which was accomplished by the Mother of God?

²¹ Luke 1:35.

²² The proclamation of the Virgin Mary begins with the verification of the angel that she has found "grace in the sight of God." Luke 1:31.

²³ For details regarding the error of this dogma see J. O. Kalogerou, Μαρία ἡ Ἀεινάρθενος Θεοτόκος κατὰ τὴν Ὁρθόδοξον Πίστιν (Mary the Ever-Virgin Theotokos according to the Orthodox Faith), Salonika, 1957, pp. 81 f.

original by uniting it with the divine beauty).²⁴ Their represented figures, therefore, could not have been the material and corruptible (those before grace), but those of ἀγιότητος (holiness), that is, those of heavenly δόξα (glory), with which they were clothed.²⁵ Here again, therefore, Orthodox iconography moves from the belief of the Church that ἔτέρα μὲν ἡ τῶν ἐπουρανίων (σωμάτων) δόξα, ἔτέρα δὲ ἡ τῶν ἐπιγείων, (one is the glory of the heavenly (bodies), and another of the earthly).²⁶ The saints and the martyrs are regarded as ἐπουρανίοι (heavenly), citizens of heaven. And because οἷος ὁ ἐπουρανίος τοιοῦτοι καὶ οἱ ἐπουρανίοι (as the heavenly one is, so also are they who are heavenly),²⁷ the saints are represented with such a schematic composition in order to dismiss one directly from the forms of daily life, that is, the forms of corruption and to inspire the blessed reality beyond this world, where the light of the Incorrputible and heavenly God shines. The physiognomies of the saints, therefore, as they are rendered in the wall-paintings and in the portable icons of our Church, become a continual commentary to the faithful that δεῖ τὸ φθαρτὸν ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν, (the corruptible must be clothed in incorrputibility and the mortal in immortality).²⁸ In other words, Orthodox iconography attempts here to give, in some manner, an idea of the spiritual bodies which will follow the resurrection of the dead, to express the ἔτέραν δόξαν τῶν ἐπουρανίων, καὶ ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ σωμάτων, (other glory of the heavenly, and incorrputible bodies).²⁹

²⁴ *Triodeon*, p. 137.

²⁵ Cf. the often repeated phrase in the dismissal hymns of the Church regarding the saints: δόξα τῷ σὲ δοξάσαντι Χριστῷ . . . (glory to Christ who glorified thee . . .).

²⁶ I Cor. 15:40.

²⁷ I Cor. 15:48.

²⁸ I Cor. 15:53. Also, καθὼς ἐφορέσαμεν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χοϊκοῦ, φορέσομεν καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου, (As we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly).

²⁹ I Cor. 15:40, 48. Cf. also Philippians 3:21: δεῖς μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτὸς σύμμορφον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, (who shall change our body of humility to become fashioned like (the body) of His glory).

B. MORE PARTICULAR ELEMENTS OF FORM IN ICONOGRAPHY

1. *The Sacred Physiognomies*

After the quick exposition of the more general reasons for the form of Orthodox iconography, we proceed now, specifically, to the examination of its more particular elements.

First of all, the sacred physiognomies manifest technically the faces and their naked parts in a manner absolutely in agreement with whatever was said above. The iconographer, with a few colors, with full but steady and vital use of the brush, renders the spirit of his sublime art. In the art of the catacombs³⁰ and in the miniatures,³¹ the artist, with a minimum of "brush strokes," delineates the facial characteristics in their simplest form. The same is true with the wall-paintings. For example, in the famous Divine Liturgy of the Peribleptos church of Mystra,³² with a few white lights upon the prominent parts (forehead, nose, cheeks, beard) of the face, whose general tone (*προτίχων*) is of deep chestnut-color, the unknown artist succeeded in creating supra-worldly forms, shadows and visions from another world. Two white dots on each side of the nose become capable of indicating (in the midst of the whole shadowy face) the glow of the world of God as well as the *τρόμος καὶ φόβος* (fear and trembling) of heavenly Powers serving the great Mystery.

The general procedure for the depiction of the faces consists in drawing the features with gray or black pigment into a middle tone painted either with yellow ocher, or with a warmer ocher mixed with red.³³ The same pigment of gray or black is used for

³⁰ See examples in the recent edition of W. F. Volbach and M. Hirmer, *Frühchristliche Kunst, Die Kunst der spätantike in West und Ostrom*, München, 1958, p. 7 (from the catacomb of SS. Callistus and Domitilla), p. 9 (catacomb of SS. Callistus and Priscilla), p. 10 (St. Domitilla).

³¹ As an example see the codex of Rossano (6th century). A good picture of its pages see in Grabar, *Peinture Byzantine*, pp. 162, 163.

³² Regarding the liturgical significance of this wall-painting, we have already spoken above. *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. XII, No. 2 (Winter 1966-1967), p. 178.

³³ Often we have the characteristic wheat-colored base as for example in the "Ομορφη Ἐκκλησιᾳ" of Patesia, Athens.

painting the outlines which separate the faces from the background and at the same time enhance their vitality. At times in the wall paintings, but more often in the portable icons dating from the 16th century, the general color tone of the faces and also of the nude areas of the bodies is painted dark or chestnut-colored. Over this tone are painted a few lights shaped either as spots, or as very thin parallel whitish lines, referred to as ψυμνθίαι. The latter are painted either directly over the dark ground, creating an effect of abrupt transition from the shaded area to the light; or they are painted in several color gradations, successively toned downward: a process known as γλυκασμός.

This use of outlines is an integral part of calligraphic manner or technique of painting, whereby the element of line is employed for depicting the features and details of the faces. The use of chiaroscuro, on the other hand, is either minimal, or totally absent. Nevertheless, Orthodox hagiography is not entirely oblivious to the opposite or impressionistic technique of painting whereby all outlines or hard contours are avoided, and other linear elements are either limited or totally absent, and chiaroscuro becomes dominant, enhancing the mass as well as the details.³⁴

The same principles govern the *style* of our iconography in the formation of the details in the sacred physiognomies. That is to say, the eyes, the nose, the ears (the sensory organs) are not rendered according to nature, to the anatomical truth, because each of them, having sensed and received the divine Revelation, has become now an organ of the spirit and "has been changed" (ἵλλοιώθη). This change of every sensory organ is interpreted by Orthodox iconography, especially by the known *stylization*. By means of the so often misinterpreted schematic order, this sublime art attempts to denote that each sensory organ, having received the divine Grace and having contributed in its appropriation by the represented sacred person, was sanctified and therefore has ceased to be the usual sensory organ of the biological man. Thus, we can understand why, at first, the eyes are painted large and animated,³⁵ expressive of psychical intensity. Because they have seen

³⁴ See examples in Grabar, *Peinture Byzantine*, *op. cit.*, pp. 166, 168, 171, 173.

³⁵ See e.g. the sacred faces in the mosaics of Hosios Loukas near Le-vadeia, Diez-Demus, *Byzantine Mosaics in Greece; Hosios Lucas*, 1931.

the great things, they have been opend to the sublime³⁶ and, of course, through them the study of the divine Law and the vision of the works of the Creator have entered into the conscience of the represented saint. Through those large eyes the represented saints verify: Οἱ ὁφθαλμοὶ μου διαπαντὸς πρὸς τὸν Κύριον. Εἴδον οἱ ὁφθαλμοὶ μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου . . . Ἐμελέτησα ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔργοις σου, ἐν ποιήμασι τῶν χειρῶν σου ἐμελέτησα, (Mine eyes are ever toward the Lord; for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation . . . I meditate on all Thy works, in the creation of Thy hands have I mused).³⁷ Likewise we can understand why the ears are drawn large (usually characteristically stylized).³⁸ They have been widened to hear the commandments of the Lord, and through them the saint εἰσακήκοε τῆς θείας οἰκονομίας τὸ μυστήριον (has heard the mystery of divine economy). They are rather in a symbolic sense a projection of the ears of the soul, which ἐγένοντο προσέχοντα (became attentive) since those of nature have been shut to the noise τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου (of this world). The nose also is often larger than its natural length and thin, because it is not meant to perform a physiological service, that is, it does not smell the things of this world, but the ὀσμὴν εὐώδίας πνευματικῆς (smell of spiritual fragrance), the εὐώδίαν τῆς Ἅγιας Τριάδος (the fragrance of the Holy Trinity), according to Didymus the Blind,³⁹ or the ὀσμὴν τῆς ἀφθαρσίας (smell of incorruption) which Christ and the Holy Spirit emit, according to Irenaeus.⁴⁰

The same things are true even for the mouth. The mouth is shaped small to denote by it that the represented sacred person, obeying the commandment μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τὶ φάγητε ή

³⁶ Cf. Psalm 118:18 (119): 'Αποκάλυψον τοὺς ὁφθαλμούς μου καὶ κατανοήσω τὰ θαυμάσια ἐκ τοῦ νόμου σου, (Open Thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law).

³⁷ Psalm 24:15 (25); St. Luke 2:30; Psalm 142:5 (143).

³⁸ The stylization is also common in the hair and the beard. Iconography often renders the curled hair with well arranged small rounded bodies or twisted folds, or with wave-like, uniformly successive curves; the beard is shaped in the same manner. All these denote the willful avoidance of representing the natural man in favor of manifesting the "other glory" of the spiritual man.

³⁹ Migne, P.G. 39, 589.

⁴⁰ Ibid, 7, 480.

τὸν πίητε, (take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink),⁴¹ limited himself to the indispensable and necessary food for preservation; seeking πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ, (first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness),⁴² συνεκάλυψε δὲ ἐν τῇ νηστείᾳ τὴν ψυχήν του (he has chastened his soul with fasting).⁴³ Moreover, the small mouth is also a more general indication of spirituality, a symbolism of the paradisiacal blessedness of a body materially not in need, a body which, according to Cyril of Jerusalem, οὐκέτι τροφῶν τοιούτων χρείαν ἔχει πρὸς ζωήν . . . γίνεται γὰρ πνευματικὸν θαυμάσιόν τι καὶ οἶον εἰπεῖν κατ' ἀξίαν οὐκ ἔχομεν, (no longer has the need of such foods for sustaining life . . . for it becomes a spiritual wonder of which we cannot speak worthily).⁴⁴

The heads of the saints are encircled in the known crown of light (nimbus, halo). Many have the impression that its use (together with certain other points) is enough to denote the "holiness" of the represented person. This has been taught by the religious art of the West, whose sacred persons are so worldly in appearance that the nimbus is indispensable to signify that a saint is being represented. In Orthodox art, however, one does not depend upon the crown of light alone to understand that the represented person is a saint. Holiness is indicated by the entire form, the technic and the style of iconography. Certainly, even the crown of light is one characteristic of the holiness of the depicted physiognomies, and has with us a profounder meaning than in the West, as we shall see. But because the whole style of our iconography denotes directly the sacredness of the represented persons, we can say that the crown of light — even though it is of the elements of Orthodox art — does not have a basic significance as it is usually thought. In fact, it is missing from the iconography of older Christian representation as well as from certain scenes in the iconography of the Byzantine period. Thus, in the wall-paintings of the catacombs, Christ, the Theotokos, the martyrs are represented without nimbus.⁴⁵ Similarly, in most of the

⁴¹ St. Matthew 6:25.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 6:38.

⁴³ Psalm 68:11 (69:10).

⁴⁴ Migne, P.G. 33, 613, Catechesis 18.

⁴⁵ See e.g. Christ as the good Shepherd in the catacomb of St. Callistus in Rome; Christ among the twelve Apostles in the catacomb of St.

sarcophagi of the 4th century especially, and in the ivory engravings from the 4th to the 6th centuries, as well as in some mosaics, there is no crown of light.⁴⁶ In the iconographic scenes of the Byzantine period, such as e.g. the Ascension, the Dormition of the Theotokos, etc.,⁴⁷ the Apostles are usually shown without this distinctive mark.⁴⁸

The crown of light in Orthodox iconography signifies the radi-

Domitilla; the Theotokos and Child in the catacomb of St. Priscilla, etc. See picture in Volbach-Hirmer, *op. cit.*, illustr. 7-10.

⁴⁶ See e.g. the sarcophagus called the adelphia of the National Museum of Syracuse, Italy, where, among other things, the Adoration of the Magi and the Palm Sunday are depicted; the sarcophagus in St. Peter's in Rome of Junius Vassa where scenes from the life of Christ and the Apostles are shown; the sarcophagus in the Museum of St. Ambrose in Milano where Christ is shown with His disciples, and others. Also among the ivory engravings see the relic-case in the Museo Civico of Brescia which depicts Jesus, His disciples and scenes from His life (miracles, Passion). See also representations on the diptych of the cathedral church of Milano (5th century) with scenes from the life of Jesus, and the known throne of Maximianus in Ravenna, etc. Among the mosaics see the saints in the dome of St. George in Salonika. Cf. also F. Gerke, *Vorkonstantinische Sarkophage*, pp. 208 f.; G. Bovini, *I sarcofagi paleocristiani*, 1949, p. 218; J. Wilpert, *I sarcofagi Cristiani I*, illustr. 13; G. Belvederi, in *Ambrosiana*, Milano, 1942, p. 177; and Vorbach-Hirmer, *op. cit.*, illustr. 85-89, 124, 125, and 230-232.

⁴⁷ Such as Palm Sunday (*Batōv*), the Nipter (Jesus washing the feet of His disciples).

⁴⁸ See e.g. the Apostles of the Koimesis in Daphni, of the Ascension in Pantanassa, and of the Koimesis in the Perivleptos of Mystra. Likewise see the Apostles of the same scene in the Sopotchani and the Gratchanitsa of Serbia. Cf. Millet, *Mistra*, illustr. 116 and 137, also Schweinfurth, *Byz. Form*, (1st edition), illustr. 34. Grabar, *Peinture byzantine*, *op. cit.*, pp. 148, 149. (By contrast with a crown of light see triptych of the 10th century in Brummer Gallery, ed. title *Early Christian and Byzantine Art*, (an exhibition held at the Baltimore Museum of Art), Baltimore, 1947, illustr. XXIX, 140. Also in the post-Byzantine icons of the Koimesis we have crowns of light. See Xyngopoulos, *Catalogue*, *op. cit.*, (illustr. 45, A). In other scenes again of the Byzantine and post-Byzantine period, such as e.g. the Last Supper, sometimes there are crowns of light and sometimes they are missing. See for example the Last Supper in St. Mark's of Venice (Bettini, *Mosaici antichi di San Marco a Venezia*, illustr. XIV) and by contrast see the same scene in St. Nicholas Anapausa of the Meteora (1527), a work of Theophanes of Crete, following, of course, the types of the older manuscripts. (See such in Millet, *Recherches sur l'iconographie de l'Evangile*, Paris, 1916, fig. 277-279.)

ating glory of the represented person.⁴⁹ It surrounds the head because the head is the center of the spirit, thought and understanding. It is understood, of course, that this light, being spherical, refers to the entire head. In art, however, it is represented as a light disk, that is, as a cut-away of the light sphere.⁵⁰ The color of this disk, which is usually gold or yellow,⁵¹ contributes in emphasizing the whole face of the saint; the crown of light becomes, in a manner, the lighted space and the direct background in which the revered head is projected and emphasized.

In the West, even the spiritual character of this symbol of iconography was misunderstood. In most instances, it received the form of a circular brim often elliptical (for perspective reasons) sketched over and beyond the head (that is, not touching the head) of the sacred persons. Thus, the crown of light appears as something entirely external, as a crown rather of an athletic victory and not as a personal reflection, as a radiance emitted from within the form of the represented saint. Works of Ghirlandajio, Botticelli, Fra Bartolomeo, Dolci, Raphael, Da Vinci, and others are some such off-hand examples.⁵²

⁴⁹ The crown of light was known also in pagan art; it also encircled there the head of gods or royal persons, obviously to indicate their divine origin. The head of Buddah, for example, was often encircled with the crown of light. (Many and interesting examples can be seen in the Muséum Gume of Paris.) A crown of light was also borne by royal persons of Byzantine art (see off-hand as an example Justinia and Theodora in Volbach-Hirmer, *op. cit.*, illustr. 166, 167. Cf. S. Lambros, Λεύκωμα Βυζαντινῶν Αὐτοκρατόρων (Album of Byzantine Emperors) Athens, 1930.

⁵⁰ It is known that the crown of light of living persons was in the shape of a rectangle. See off-hand an example in Grabar, *Peinture byzantine*, p. 50. (Here the battlements painted behind each saint play the role of the crown of light). p. 78.

⁵¹ There are crowns of light of different colors in one scene, usually of many persons, such as the Last Supper, the Ascension, the Resurrection, the Second Coming, etc. See as examples the Resurrection (Descent into Hades) of the Nea Moné in Chios (picture in Grabar, *ibid.*, p. 112), the Adoration of the Magi in the church of the Theotokos in Cosmidium of Rome, a work of the 8th century (*ibid.*, p. 79), the Second Coming (angels escorting the enthroned Apostles) in the church of the Theotokos in Kritsa (C. Kalokyris, Ἡ Παναγία τῆς Κριτσᾶς, Herakleion, Crete, 1952, p. 243), and others.

⁵² See in this relation I. Fattorusso, *Florence*, pp. 126, 160, 161. Mesnil, *Raphael*, illustr. 18, 22, 40, 53, 59. Basler, *Leonardo da Vinci*, illustr. 13, 23.

The manner of rendering the other naked parts of the body, such as the uncovered parts of the hands and the feet, is analogous to that particular manner by which the faces and their characteristics are fashioned to express the spiritual ideal in our iconography. Both the hands and the feet are often drawn indifferently to the natural truth. Often the fingers of the hands are disproportionately large, while the blessing right hand receives in many instances the dimensions of the head.⁵³ The large fingers, of course, are expressive of spiritual intensity. Through them the spiritual life of the sacred person is projected and interpreted. The blessing of the Lord is not a mere gesture, but an expression of the Grace which is gifted. Especially worthy of mention are certain hands of Christ in Orthodox art. Thus, in Daphni the hands of Christ are anti-realistic, but of tremendous power to agree with His very robust face as the Pantocrator. Here the phalanx bones of the fingers are clearly distinguished from each other by an angular or curved contour, and they show such a pulsation of life and superior spiritual strength that directly—after the dominating face—they draw the whole attention of the believer and contribute in making perceptible the active presence of the All-mighty God. Especially the hand with which the Pantocrator holds the Gospel, with protruding index finger, presents something exceptionally unnatural. A. Grabar thinks it is possible that the deformation of this hand resulted from the designing difficulty of the person setting the mosaic pieces in the hollow surface of the dome.⁵⁴ We think, however, that it would be possible to regard this "deformation" as purposeful, that is, as related to the intention of the artist to symbolize the significance of the Gospel borne by this hand, to express by such a hand οὐχὶ κατὰ ἀνθρώπον (not of man) that the book it bears is not a common book, but the Book *par excellence*, the "Evangelion" which οὐκ ἔστι κατὰ ἀνθρώπον (is not of man).⁵⁵ In the icon "Touch me not" (scenes

⁵³ Grabar, *Peinture byzantine*, p. 37.

⁵⁴ Grabar, *Peinture byzantine*, p. 118.

⁵⁵ Galatians 1:11. Our opinion is supported by the fact that the example of Daphni is not an isolated one. Similar hands holding the Gospel can be seen in the Pantocrator of the Ομόοψη Ἐκκλησία of Patesia, Athens, and of the Pammakaristos Monastery of Constantinople (Fetihe tzami). A similar meaning is expressed, in many instances, with the hands of other holy persons who bear sacred objects, e.g. of the Theotokos hold-

from the Resurrection) by Michael Damascenos (16th century),⁵⁶ the right hand of Christ is again of extreme interest, as it is extended toward Mary Magdalene kneeling before Him and stretching her right hand toward the Lord. Although these hands are closer to the natural truth because of the particular period of iconography and the general style of Damascenos,⁵⁷ they have, nevertheless, such expressive power that, as one is extended toward the other with so much spiritual nobility and grace, they leave the viewer with the impression that they speak and that they alone were enough to render the theme of the icon. From the extended hand of Christ toward Mary who is eager to adore Him, one can sense the conveyance of the pulse of the gentle word, "Touch me not," while at the same time, from the contracting hand of Mary Magdalene, one can see the direct consequent result of the divine exhortation.

The hands of the saints too are of the same style. The Fore-runner, for example, pointing with his right hand to the approaching Christ coming to be baptized, has the index finger of this hand characteristically large (*Ιδε ὁ ἀμνός . . . behold the lamb . . .*). This obviously notes that the indicated person is great and his work is also great. He is ὁ ἀμνός τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, (the lamb of God who bears the sin of the world).⁵⁸ A very good sample of expression of inner life are the fingers of the hands of Joseph crossed over his chest in the panel icon of the "Adoration of the Magi" by the iconographer Tzanfournari (17th century).⁵⁹ As we have already said in another place,⁶⁰ these lighted and very large fingers, as they extend upon his shadowy chest, "actually speak and express that which possesses

ing the Infant Christ, of the Evangelists holding a Gospel book, etc. In these instances the fingers are not deformed, but they are disproportionately large to denote precisely the great significance of the object they hold.

⁵⁶ It is found in the metropolitan church of St. Menas in Herakleion.

⁵⁷ About this artist see the study of S. Bettini, *Il pittore Michele Damasceno*, etc. in *Atti del Reale Inst. Veneto di Sc. Let. ed Arti*, 1934-5, vol. 94, which is, however, incomplete.

⁵⁸ John 1:29.

⁵⁹ In the Museum Benaki. Ch. Xyngopoulos, *Catalogue*, p. 34, illustr. 16.

⁶⁰ In the book 'Η Γέννησις τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τὴν Βυζαντινὴν Τέχνην τῆς Ελλάδος' (The Birth of Christ in Byzantine Art of Greece), Athens, 1956.

his heart, that is, the obedience to the angelic prediction and the appropriate awe for the new-born Child."

We have similar observations for the feet of the saints. The legs are usually exceptionally slender, with a strong hollowness of the soles of the feet, with long toes or, sometimes, with a peculiar flat-footed formation by an intense curving of the heel to render unnaturally even the lowest section of the limbs. Of the many examples of this last form we note as characteristic the feet of St. John the Baptist in the mosaic of the Baptism of Christ in the church of San Marco in Venice (11th century),⁶¹ the feet of the Apostles in the representation of the Holy Communion in the church of Sopotchani in Serbia (1265) and in the scene of the Death of the Theotokos in the same church (especially the Apostles Peter and Paul),⁶² of the Apostles of the Ascension in the church of Pantanassa in Mystra (15th century),⁶³ of Jesus in the wall-painting of the raising of Lazarus in the church of the Theotokos in Lampiotes, Crete (15th century),⁶⁴ and of others which lead us to the art of the manuscripts.⁶⁵

Besides the faces, the hands and the feet, there are other instances where Orthodox iconography presents the bodies naked in part or in whole. This happens, for example, in the Baptism of Christ where He is depicted entirely naked or with a waist-cloth, in the Whipping and in the Crucifixion where He always wears the waist-cloth. Also in the scenes of the punishments in Hell, the bodies of men and women being punished are shown naked in the fire. The bodies of certain saints or martyrs appear entirely naked or with a waist-cloth in the scenes of their martyrdom.⁶⁶ Common is the scene of Abba Zossima giving Communion to Mary of Egypt, who is half naked.

⁶¹ Bettini, *Mosaici antichi*, illustr. CIII.

⁶² Oto Bihalji-Merin, *Fresques et Icônes*, illustr. 39, 44.

⁶³ Millet, *Mistra*, illustr. 37.

⁶⁴ C. Kalokyris, *The Byzantine Wall-paintings*, illustr. X, 1.

⁶⁵ Cf. e.g. the Laurentian codex VI, 23. See also *Early Christian and Byzantine Art*, Baltimore, No. 725 and illustr. CIV.

⁶⁶ The naked are also found in the scenes from the Old Testament, e.g. the creation and fall of Adam and Eve, the intoxication of Noah, and others. See Bettini, *op. cit.*, illustr. LIV, LV, LIX. Naked or half-naked are also the children in the Palm Sunday scene, and Christ as an infant in the scene of his bath (Birth of Christ).

The power of Orthodox iconography appears precisely in these instances of the naked. The iconographer, having subjugated matter to the spirit, created bodies of such form that truly no earthly or carnal thing was implied but only lead one to the high idea, which they sought to express through them. When one sees, for example, the naked Christ in the Jordan of the mosaic of the Baptism in Daphni and in Hosios Loukas near Levadeia, or of the wall-painting in the Peribleptos church of Mystra, he is not overcome by the idea of the nakedness, but is rather overcome by the idea which the representation expresses. The sense of nakedness, as such, in its natural context, of course, has been neutralized by the spiritual power of Orthodox art. Through this power of the spirit, the figures appear dematerialized, the bodies ἀσαρκά (without flesh), clothed τὴν δόξαν τῶν ἐπονοματίων (in the glory of the heavenly things). To achieve this, the style of Orthodox iconography resorts to certain daring anti-realistic designs. The sides of the thorax are stylized with strong arches, the chest with uniform corresponding curves, the knees are in the shape of an eight, etc. Such as we see in the body of Christ in the scenes of the Baptism, of the Crucifixion, and others. Thus, here again the order of stylization follows the general principle of avoiding the strict anatomical reality in order to serve the ideal of disembodiment (*Entkörperlichung*), which permits the exhaltation of the spiritual nucleus, the expression of which is the primary purpose of this art.

In our iconography there are also instances in which certain bodies are painted with an over-emphasis of certain members or parts. This we meet mainly in the representations of hell where some members, related to committed sins, are drawn much larger than necessary, for the purpose of indicating directly and more impressively their characteristics. Thus, in the mosaic of the Punishments in the Basilica of Torcello (12th century),⁶⁷ certain bodies in the fire have their stomachs swollen and falling low, to indicate the sin of gluttony for which they are being punished.⁶⁸ The same is true with other parts of the bodies connected with sins in the scene of the Punishments in the church of the Apostles (15th century) in Kandanos, Crete, in the church of Panayia (middle aisle) in Kritsa, in the Refectory of the Monastery of

⁶⁷ It is a section of the scene of the Second Coming.

⁶⁸ See colored picture in Grabar, *Peinture byzantine*, p. 120.

Laura on Mount Athos, and others.⁶⁹

The anti-realistic iconography of sacred persons is completed by the whole appearance of their garments. Even these, of course, are fashioned in agreement with the general principle of Orthodox iconography, by which the major premise of spirituality is served. The garments project or signify the spiritual bodies of the saints covered by them. And because such bodies, naturally, are not visible, the garments with their entire form become an expression of them. Because of this, simple folds and their wider overlaps do not have the so-called naturalness, that is, they are not like those shapes which garments receive when covering the human body. Not only this, but in certain rarer instances, the folds of the clothing do not correspond completely with the covered members of the bodies. In these instances, tunics, mantles, cloaks, etc. are lapped and folded, if not unrelated to the mass and the movements of the members of the bodies under them, at least more and more intensely than is naturally imposed by their mass or their movement.⁷⁰ We note this here because very often even this is misunderstood and is regarded as a weakness of the painters. Of course, the natural in the design of the folds of the garments is precisely the indication of the mass of the bodies and of the movements of their members. Quite often, however, the over-emphasis of the order of stylization which the folds receive to convey transcendence and the whole disposition for exalting in every way the supernatural truth, legitimatize and justify their anti-naturalistic presentation.

In the older works especially (or even in the later works following older originals) the foldings of the garments are emphatically lineal. Vertical lines of a darker color than the garments, often going parallel, indicate the folds. By this means the clothes attain a certain flatness and seem to be deprived of plasticity, which they especially receive later. Characteristic samples of this type of foldings are the mosaics of St. Demetrios in Salonika (7th century) and especially the one showing the saint be-

⁶⁹ Millet, *Athos*, illustr. 149. Cf. also *Mistra*, illustr. 80, 1 etc.

⁷⁰ See e.g. the mantle of Christ in the Resurrection of the church of the Theotokos in the village of Lampiotes, Crete, in 'Εκκλησία, Easter, 1960. See also C. Kalokyris, *The Byzantine Wall-paintings*, illustr. XIX (angel).

tween the Bishop John and the Eparch Leontius.⁷¹ We have similar lineal foldings in the mosaics of Justinian and Theodora with their court in St. Vitalius of Ravenna (6th century),⁷² in the procession of martyrs moving toward Christ in the new church of St. Apollinarius of the same city (6th century),⁷³ and in the scenes of the life of Christ in the same church.⁷⁴ In the following periods, however, the folds in the clothing become well-curved and in relief (rendered particularly with a great deal of freedom), and plasticity becomes a characteristic of the garments. Such a marvelous draping of the garments is especially that of the mosaics in Daphni (11th century). By contrast to the lineal folding of certain garments observed here, however, the prophets in the dome, the Apostles in the Koimesis, the angels (especially in the scene of Joakeim and Anna praying and of the Birth of Christ), St. John before the Cross and the many other sacred persons wear garments of such fine form that they remind one, without doubt, of the draping garments on the statues of classical antiquity.⁷⁵ From this viewpoint another successful draping of garments is in the famous mosaics in the Monastery of Chora (Kahrie Djami) in Constantinople (14th century)⁷⁶ and in the wall-paintings of the south chapel of the same monument,⁷⁷ which contributes especially to the slenderness, to the elegance and to the whole spir-

⁷¹ See G. and M. Sotiriou, 'Η Βασιλικὴ τοῦ Ἀγίου Δημητρίου Θεσσαλονίκης (The Basilica of St. Demetrios of Salonika). Cf. also Volbach-Hirmer, *op. cit.*, illustr. 217, and Grabar, *Peinture byzantine*, p. 50.

⁷² Volbach-Hirmer, *ibid.*, illustr. 164-167 (in color).

⁷³ *Ibid.*, illustr. 55. Cf. also the older Corrado Ricci, *Ravenna*, Bergamo, illustr. 59, for the entire procession.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, illustr. 61-86. Cf. the lineal folds of the mosaics in the Nea Moné of Chios such as e.g. of the Crucifixion (the women), of Lazarus, etc. See Orlando, *Monuments byzantins de Chios*, Athens, 1930, illustr. 19, 23.

⁷⁵ Millet, *Daphni*, at the end of the book.

⁷⁶ Th. Schmitt, "Kahrie-Dzami," in the Bulletin (Isvestija) of the imperial Russian archaeological institute of Constantinople, vol. XI, Sofia, 1906. Color pictures in Grabar, *Peinture byzantine*, pp. 113, 137.

⁷⁷ For the wall-paintings of the chapel (with their identification) see P. Underwood in Dumbarton Oaks Papers 9, 10 of 1956, 11 of 1957 f. See especially the foldings in the famous Descent into Hades in 9, 10, of 1956, illustr. 66.

itual nobility of the figures.⁷⁸ Of undoubtedly exceptional interest for its smoothness and fine curvature is the folding in the garments of the sacred figures in the chapel of St. Euthemius⁷⁹ beside the church of St. Demetrius of Salonika, in the church of St. Catherine in the same city, and in the scenes of the Protaton church on Mount Athos⁸⁰. No less significant are the Byzantine monuments of Serbia during the 13th and 14th centuries, which of course are undoubtedly under the influence of Constantinople and Salonika. Thus we note the fine curves of the many-fold garments of the saints in the wall-paintings of Sopotchani (1260-1265) ⁸¹ and especially of the holy Apostles in the scene of the Koimesis of the Theotokos,⁸² as well as the amazing freedom and grace expressed in the clothing of the Apostles of the same scene and of the raising of Lazarus of Gratchanitsa (1321),⁸³ whose fringes are especially emphasized by the orderly waving refoldings in geometrical figures.⁸⁴

A characteristic of these folds in the clothing of Orthodox iconography is precisely the principle of shaping them geometri-

⁷⁸ The same is true for the mosaics of the Holy Apostles church in Salonika, with the only difference being that here as in the Monastery of Chora (Kahrie-Dzami), we do not observe the delicateness of the folds as we have in the above mentioned mosaics of Daphni.

⁷⁹ G. and M. Sotiriou, *Album, op. cit.*, illustr. 93B, 83.

⁸⁰ Millet, *Athos*, illustr. 12, 4; 13, 3; 30, 2; etc. Cf. also Xyngopoulos, Μανουὴλ Πανσεληνός (Manuel Panselenos), Athens, 1956, (illustr. 1, 2, 13). Also C. Kalokyris, *Athos, Themes of Archaeology and Art*, chp. 2.

⁸¹ The iconographer of this work must certainly have come from Constantinople as indicated by his whole style. Moreover, from the preserved signatures the names are known of Greek artists who came from Salonika and Constantinople to paint the walls of churches in Serbia and to teach the Serbs during the reign of King Miloutin. The wall-paintings of Sopotchani are a Byzantine work; the opinion of O. Mihaldji-Merin (repeating the views of the earlier Serbs) that these belong to the "peinture monumentale médiévale serbe" (according to the French translation of the book by A. Daussy) is of course incorrect (*Fresques et Icônes — notes explicatives* — between no. 38 and 39, see also p. 12).

⁸² *Ibid.*, illustr. 39. See also the similar scene (the empty tomb of the Theotokos) in Stoudenitsa (1314), illustr. 30.

⁸³ The iconographer of this work is associated with Salonika and particularly with the Protaton church of Mount Athos.

⁸⁴ Petcović, *Le peinture Serbe du moyen âge*, vol. I, Beograd, 1930, illustr. 50, and color picture in Grabar, *La peinture byzantine*, p. 149. The scene of Lazarus see in O. Mihaldji-Merin, *op. cit.*, illustr. 57.

cally in order and usually in agreement to the mass of the bodily members under them. This principle, despite all the free formation of the clothing, deprives the folds of naturalness (that is, the slavish imitation of the form of the garment of everyday man) and offers a particular spirituality and grace both to the clothing and to the body it covers. The anti-realistic lighting contributes especially to this supra-sensual impression of the clothing. This lighting is usually achieved by a light (whitish, rosy, etc.) color, that is, by the color of the garment, but in a lighter tone or even by a complementary color placed in diagonal shapes or in spots at the prominent points or at the edges of the folds and along their course. The strong lighting especially on the darker garments not only contributes to the impression of the dematerialization of the forms, but also emphasizes the radiance and the splendour of the spiritual world, which it symbolizes and co-extends to the creation of the whole transcendent atmosphere of iconography.⁸⁵ By means of successful coloring and this wisely calculated lighting in the necessary and particular points (in which truly the Byzantines have proven to be unique), the clothing is made truly ethereal. This we see, for example, in the often mentioned angels of the Liturgy in the Peribleptos church in Mystra, in the Apostles of the above mentioned Koimesis of the Theotokos in Gratchanitsa and of the Holy Communion in the Monastery of Vrontessi in Crete, and in a great number of other monuments.⁸⁶ Other times again in the mosaics and particularly in the portable icons (primarily of Christ and the Theotokos) the lighting of the garment is gold, achieved in the prominent parts by the use of oval, rectangular or usually triangular golden shapes from the sides of which gold lines move to indicate the folds (see the mantle of Christ in the famous icon of Michael Damascenos, "Touch me not.") From among the mosaic garments, lighted in the same manner, the mantle of Christ of the Descent into Hades in the Nea Moné of Chios (11th century)⁸⁷ with the comb-like lighting,⁸⁸ the maphorium of the Theotokos in the scene of the Birth of Christ in the Capella Palatina in Palermo

⁸⁵ See e.g. the lighting of the garments of the angels in the Birth of Christ of Daphni.

⁸⁶ C. Kalokyris, *The Byzantine Wall-paintings of Crete*, p. 98.

⁸⁷ Orlando, *Monuments byzantins de Chios*, illustr. 19, 20, 3.

⁸⁸ This lighting is applied chiefly from this period on.

(12th century),⁸⁹ are only some examples at random.⁹⁰ Finally, in some instances, the anti-realistic lighting, which is made geometrically more intense, reaches the point of being indicated by the particularly impressive large rounded spots placed on the clothing just at the points where there is a corresponding rounded or curved member of the body. Such form of clothing we have in the mosaics of San Marco of Venice. In the dome of the church depicting the Ascension, most of the figures (angels, prophets, apostles, personifications) have such rounded lighting upon their mantles at the thighs, elbows, knees, and breast.⁹¹ In the scene of the unbelief of Thomas, the mantle of the doubting Apostle, folded with direct lines and lighted in the same manner at the slackened left leg, is lighted at the projecting right leg by three successive clear geometric shapes, that is, the large circle corresponding to the hip-joint (the buttock), the trapezium corresponding to the thigh, and the circular section corresponding to the lower leg.

The garments of the sacred persons are worthy of examination from the viewpoint of color also. Even though one observes a colorful variety and wealth, the clothing does not have colors or repulsive liveliness, but on the contrary, their use is characterized by undertone and good taste. Delicate shades of the red, blue, and green are consecrated for the garments of Christ and the Theotokos, while for the other sacred persons the shades are always less pronounced. A multitude of such examples of bright and luminous colored garments (of tones always agreeable to the climate of high nobility in iconography) we have in the Byzantine and post-Byzantine portable icons.⁹² The modesty of the

⁸⁹ Demus, *The Mosaics of Norman Sicily*, London, 1949.

⁹⁰ From the large number of panel icons we note as evidence two of the Virgin Mary and Child (particularly for the mantle of Christ) in the Benaki Museum (Xyngopoulos, *Catalogue*, illustr. 36, no. 47, 48) and the mantle of Christ in the famous icon showing the Theotokos holding Child and called "The Peribleptos" (14th century), found in the church of St. Clement of Ochrid (O. Mihaldji-Merin, *op. cit.*, illustr. 69, in color).

⁹¹ Bettini, *Mosaice antichi*, illustr. XVI, XXI. See also illustr. LXVIII, LXX, etc.

⁹² There is an infinite bibliography and an infinite number of examples regarding these. By way of indication, see G. and M. Sotiriou, *Eικόνες της Μονής Σινά* (Icons of the Monastery of Sinai), Athens, 1956, 1958, and Walter Felicetti-Liebenfels, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Ikonenmalerei*, Olten-Lausanne, 1956.

colors is characteristic in the mosaics. Besides the gold which is chiefly used for the garment of Christ and for the imperial purple robes, there are the usual shades of the white (gray), the green, the red, and the blue. The garments of the saints, in the above mentioned procession in St. Apollinarius Nuovo of Ravenna, are white. In the garments of the Apostles in the dome (the Ascension) of St. Sophia of Salonika, of the prophets in the dome of Daphni, etc., besides the use of different colors, one general light-gray tone predominates. This is owed to the prevailing large whitish or grey luminous spots, lines, etc., by which the shades of the many-fold garments are emphasized. Thus, in the general unity of the light the impression of the principal colors of the garments is diminished. This, however, in no way constitutes a shortcoming, that is, this does not create the impression of a cold monotony of a single color. On the contrary, this art succeeded by the unity of imposed color — vibrated by the calculated shades of the foldings — in connecting even more the sacred figures to each other, ordering them in the higher unity of a composition in form, by which their spiritual purity is indisputably characterized and emphasized. This spiritual purity and the relatedness of the saints in that same purity, which is marked in our iconography by the pouring of light upon their forms, is also expressed by the use of white garments. How correct this is can be seen in the Gospel codex of Rossano (Calabria) of the 6th century wherein, among others, the parable of the ten Virgins is depicted. Here, while the five foolish virgins are shown wearing many-colored, bright and impressive garments, the five prudent virgins, on the contrary, are shown clothed in modest white garments, symbols of their purity and their whole virtue.⁹³

Whatever we said above for the clothing in the mosaics of St. Sophia of Salonika and in Daphni is also applicable, more or less, to the clothing in other monuments, such as the mosaics of Hosios Loukas near Levadeia, of St. Sophia in Constantinople, of Capella Palatina in Palermo, of the Holy Apostles in Salonika, and of the Monastery of Chora (Kahrié) in Constantinople. Certainly there are differences among the clothing of these chronologically distant and stylistically separated monuments, but common to them all, more or less, are the soft and modest colors, the lack of

⁹³ A Muñoz, *Codex purpureus Rossanensis*, Roma, MCMVII, illustr. IV. Color picture in Grabar, *Peinture byzantine*, p. 163.

"loud," acute tones of red, of blue, etc. This is so because even in the cases where, for example, the red or blue colors are used, these are placed in softer tones (reddish, rosy, or bluish), or they are mitigated by the lively whitish lights, or they are restrained by the juxtaposition of a color harmonious to these in the projected garment of the same or of another person. Always the position of these colors is considered in the whole composition and especially in relation to the background of iconography. Thus, for example, in the bright blue maphorium of the infant-holding Theotokos, pictured between John II Comnenus and Irene in the mosaic in the narthex of St. Sophia in Constantinople (12th century), the impression of the bright color is mitigated not only because it is connected to the blue which is on the garments of the imperial couple, but also because the mantle and the nimbus of Christ, whom the Theotokos holds before her, is of a gold color, as the whole background of the scene is also gold. In other words, the blue maphorium of the Virgin, emphasized in the gold atmosphere of the mosaic and restrained by the all-gold garments of Christ, is fully harmonized in the entire composition. This succession of a gold background, blue garment and gold infant we have also in the mosaic (to mention another example from Constantinople) of the enthroned Christ between Constantine Monomachus and Zoe (11th century), with the difference, of course, that the position of the gold Child-Christ is here taken by the great golden Gospel which the Lord holds.⁹⁴ In the same century, in the Nea Moné of Chios, the deep-blue mantle of Christ in the scene of the Descent into Hades is connected and harmonized to the gold background of the scene by means of the gold lineal folds, as we have seen, and by the gold comb-like lights upon it.⁹⁵ The following century, in the mosaic of the Birth of Christ in the Capella Palatina of Palermo, the blue maphorium of the Virgin became all-gold from the gold lighting poured upon it. Thus, it was connected most harmoniously to the gold mountain and cave and to the whole gold background of the scene. As in Daphni so also here the impression of the color of the garment (blue) is underplayed, while the color of the light-

⁹⁴ Th. Whittemore, *The Mosaics of St. Sophia at Istanbul, The Mosaics of the Narthex*, Oxford, 1933, p. 7. Color picture in Grabar, *Peinture byzantine*, p. 99.

⁹⁵ Color picture in Grabar, *Peinture byzantine*, p. 108.

ing (gold) dominates as it is poured everywhere to unify the entire composition.⁹⁶

We have similar observations also for the colors of the garments in the wall-paintings. However, despite their advantages over against the mosaics on account of the direct use of the colors and the facility of the detail brush, the garments in the best and most classical works of this kind are rendered with soft colors corresponding fully, even here, to the nobility of the represented persons, and thus contribute to the whole transcendent atmosphere of iconography. Here also, however, the necessary bright colors of the garments — corresponding to the realistic spirit of the period — are excellently harmonized in the composition with the blue background, which dominates in the wall-paintings instead of the gold.⁹⁷ In the wall-paintings of Sopotchani,⁹⁸ (to be sufficed only with this), coinciding chronologically with the summit of the Palaiologian renaissance (second half of the 13th century), the garments of exceptional technical execution came to complete the picture of spirituality, which the physiognomies as a whole manifested. The Apostles here, for example, who approach in order to receive Communion from the hands of Christ, all wear blue tunics with strong lighting at the fringes, while their softly draping mantles are interchanged harmoniously in coloring of iodine, green and bluish, and thus receive a wondrous brilliance with the abundant lighting from their own colors but in opened tones. Through the blue tunics, the Apostles are connected to the blue-green ground upon which they walk, while through their iodine-lighted mantles they are connected to the yellow background before which (in remembrance of the gold of the art of mosaics) their bodies are projected. Thus, the Apostles, shining in their mantles and having ὑψηλαῖς ταῖς φρεσὶ (their minds exalted) — as indicated by the formation of their faces full of exaltation, approach to enjoy ξενίας Δεσποτικῆς καὶ ἀθανά-

⁹⁶ Color picture in *ibid.*, p. 130.

⁹⁷ The wall-paintings of Santa Maria Antiqua of Rome, of Castelseprio of Milano, after of St. Sophia of Ochrid, of St. Panteleimon in Nerezi, of Sopotchani (Serbia), of the chapel of St. Euthemius beside the church of St. Demetrius of Salonika, of the chapel in the Monastery of Chora in Constantinople, of the Protaton, of Stoudenitsa, of the churches of Kastoria, of Mystra, of Crete, of Rhodes, of Mt. Athos (as the Lavra) and certainly a multitude of other monuments offer such exceptional examples.

⁹⁸ Color picture in *Fresques et Icônes*, *op. cit.*, illustr. 44.

τοῦ Τραπέζης, (the hospitality of a Royal and immortal Table). It is certainly not necessary to repeat here what significance for Orthodox worship is held by this challenge to the faithful to experience the emotion of the Mystery of Holy Eucharist as it is achieved by the shapes and colors of art.

2. *The Environment in Iconography*

That which characterizes the faces, the naked parts and the garments in our iconography characterizes also the whole environment, as it will become clear. The elements of form in the environment are primarily limited to the manner by which the space is represented in the iconographies and in the background wherein the figures, the iconographic themes or their incidents are ordered.

At first we observe generally that Orthodox iconography never attempted to represent the environment in which the sacred physiognomies and the sacred scenes appear according to the naturalistic manner. Never was the surrounding space given the same value and significance as a basic expressive means of art as was given especially by Western art from the Renaissance, or rather from the period of Giotto. The attitude of the bodies, their movements, their gestures, together with the value which they possess of themselves, as well as a few other elements in general in the representation, were sufficient to indicate the space of the active persons in the sublime Orthodox art, without the necessity of amassing helpful technical means⁹⁹ formed especially for this purpose. The principal interest in our iconography, therefore, is limited to the sacred persons, while the architectural patterns, the mountains, etc. in the background of the icons are always subordinated to these persons who hold the chief part. Thus, the background does not possess self-sufficiency, that is, it does not present a formation independent of the persons, but is always integrated with them. In the Baptism, for example, Christ is in the middle of the river Jordan, while the mountains in the background are arranged orderly from the left and the right of Christ, that is, they are harmonized according to Him. In the Burial Lament, the body Jesus with the Theotokos and the other persons holds again the center of the composition, while behind on the left and the right, the rocks of the landscape are designed, and in the

⁹⁹ Such a means, e.g. is the perspective, which constitutes a technical means and not an artistic means.

empty space behind Christ the Cross is raised. Thus, the environment is rendered on the basis of the central person of the icon. In the Descent into Hades likewise, the background is filled by two precipitously graded rocks, while in the empty space between these the figure of Christ dominates.¹⁰⁰ The same is true also for the scene of the Mocking, the Touch of Thomas, etc., where behind Christ large architectural patterns are always formed to exalt His figure, while smaller architectural patterns are formed at the sides.¹⁰¹

All the above elements, which of course are not taken actually (as in the secular and especially in the Renaissance art) but only by accommodation, usually determine that which we call *space* in Orthodox iconography. As it has been made clear already, in order to render this space, the active persons are drawn on the first plane of the icon, while of the above mentioned elements only the necessary ones are summarily used for the historical setting of the scene, such as buildings, trees, rocks, mountains, etc. Their purely symbolical and not realistic meaning is also indicated by their whole design. A little green, a few roses (not usually) and four rivers denote the Garden of Eden. A ciborium surrounded by a railing symbolizes the church. The mountainous landscapes are always indicated by precipitous rocks stylized with escalations, whose stylization is intensified at the peaks. A wall with embattlements and gateways, for example, drawn behind the scene of the Crucifixion, indicates the city of Jerusalem. An event which has taken place within a closed space is usually pictured without it; the space is not of interest, but the event itself is. Thus, e.g., the visit of the Theotokos to Elizabeth is represented *outside*¹⁰² some house, before which both women stand. The Last Supper also is represented before architectural patterns often connected by the red Byzantine cloth which covers the open space be-

¹⁰⁰ See example in Xyngopoulos, *Catalogue, op. cit., illustr.* 18, 50, 51, etc.

¹⁰¹ Cf. also the scene of the Koimesis of the Theotokos where to the left and right of the Virgin and in a second plane, structures are painted, while between them, in the empty space, Christ is represented bearing the soul of His mother.

¹⁰² Despite the written declaration of the Evangelist Luke (1:49) that the Theotokos εισηλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον Ζαχαρίου καὶ ἡσπάσατο τὴν Ἐλισάβετ (entered into the house of Zacharius and saluted Elizabeth).

tween them.¹⁰³ The Annunciation of the Theotokos,¹⁰⁴ the Caress of her parents, and other internal scenes, are painted in the same manner.

A result of these symbolic and accommodating elements of the environment is that there are no regular analogies of the objects of space nor the correct and logical relationship of the persons toward them. Behind the persons, for example, in certain instances slopes of a mountain are represented; the walking figures may have one foot on one of these slopes and the other foot upon another slope. The horses, for example, bearing the Magi to the Birth of Christ, may have the two legs upon one slope in the background and the other two drawn upon another slope situated directly behind the cave. In the Birth of Christ at Daphni, the praising angels (the two on each side of the rays of the star) stand behind the peak of the rocky landscape. This does not obstruct their arms from extending above the summit-line and thus giving the impression that they are above the cave.¹⁰⁵

In the older Christian art but even in certain instances in the Byzantine, the anti-realistic characteristics are stronger. The successive incidents, for example, of one and the same theme are not separated between them but are presented without separation and upon the same plane, leaving it up to the spectator to separate them in his mind and to find their chronological coherence. This we have also in the works of sculpture art (as in the sarcophagi)¹⁰⁶ and in the miniatures of Byzantine manuscripts.¹⁰⁷ Later, however, the various incidents of a represented scene are usually separated by the folds of the ground in each of which one or more incidents are placed, as we see, for example, in the representation of the Birth of Christ (Christ-Theotokos,

¹⁰³ See e.g. in the codices such as Tetraevangelium of the National Library of Paris, Paris Gr. 54, in Millet, *Recherches*, *op. cit.*, fig. 277.

¹⁰⁴ It is understood that we are not talking here of the later period where especially in post-Byzantine panel icons, elements from the West were introduced among which there was also the representation of a related scene within the house-space.

¹⁰⁵ C. Kalokyris, *The Birth of Christ*, *op. cit.*, illustr. 1.

¹⁰⁶ See examples in Volbach-Hirmer, *op. cit.*, illustr. 37, 40, and others.

¹⁰⁷ As in the Greek manuscript 699 of the Library of the Vatican containing the Christian cosmography of Cosmas the Indicopleustes, where the conversion of the Apostle Paul on his way to Damascus is found and in which he is also represented in four unseparated incidents. See in relation to this Grabar, *Peinture byzantine*, pp. 165-167.

Angels, Magi, Shepherds, Scene of the Bath, etc.), of the Transfiguration, of Lazarus, etc. By these folds the meaning of the background is also offered here. But in many instances these folds do not exist; the rendition of the background then is made by the *superposition* of the represented figures, that is, by the placing of a row of persons precisely above the similar row at the lower part of the composition to denote that it is found on a second plane. Thus, for example, angels in the Second Coming are projected above the Apostles, Patriarchs in Paradise are drawn above Peter and the Thief, soldiers in the Child-slaying are represented some above the others, etc. But these figures situated above—that is, those represented on a higher level or those usually on a second and third plane clearly distinguished by the folds of the landscape—are not stylized always on a smaller scale, as it is demanded by the representation of the distances according to the logical laws of perspective; rather they are represented on the same scale as the lower or often even on a larger scale. For example, in the representations of the Birth of Christ, above the scene of the new-born child's bath and on a second plane next to the Child, the Virgin is represented on a larger scale, whereas, according to the logical laws of perspective, she should have been drawn smaller, as being situated further away.¹⁰⁸ That is to say that in iconography the so-called principle of ἀνεστρομμένης προ-οπτικῆς (reversed perspective) is applied, according to which the persons and things lying further away are drawn larger while the nearer are drawn smaller.¹⁰⁹ This constitutes a result of the whole spirit of Orthodox painting seeking to avoid the natural reality and being concerned for the spiritual truth. Also, in agreement with this spirit is the practice in our art of placing in the composition the events and their incidents in the order of their value as primary and secondary, that is, in order of their historical and religious significance. In such case, a person or an event μείζονος σημασίας (of greater significance) is represented on a larger scale than the other persons or events, regardless of the position (that is, the plane) on which it is found in the composition. Thus, Orthodox iconography indicates in some manner by the size of its dimensions those persons about whom worship is

¹⁰⁸ C. Kalokyris, *The Birth of Christ*, illustr. II, IX, X, XII.

¹⁰⁹ Off-hand in P. Mouratoff, *Les icônes Russes*, Paris, 1927, p. 107, and O. Wulff, *Altchristliche und Buzantinische Kunst*, I, Berlin, 1914, p. 168, and Millet, in Michel's *Histoire de l'art*, pp. 289 f.

centered. The Theotokos in the Birth, as we have seen, the angel who sits on the rock in the related representation, Christ on the Cross, Christ in the Descent into Hades, Christ among the Myrr-bearers, etc., is often of much larger proportions than the nearby persons. As specific examples we cite the Christ in the scene of the Descent into Hades in the church of St. John (position Φώρης) in Yerakari, Crete, whose proportions are three times larger than those of the raised dead at His sides.¹¹⁰ Also the Crucified Christ of San Marco in Venice¹¹¹ is larger than the soldier, piercing Him and the one giving Him vinegar, but in comparison to the soldiers casting lots for the mantle under the cross, whose representation is a secondary iconographic incident in the whole scene, Christ's is the largest figure.

But it would be an error if it were thought that the background in our iconography was always determined by the manner noted above. Three-dimensional space is not at all unknown to it. The Hellenistic branch of Christian art offered to it elements of three-dimensional space, as we see in the monumental painting and in the manuscripts. These elements were revived and used widely during the rebirth of iconography after the Iconoclast controversy and especially at the time of the Macedons and the Comneni when, as it is known, a great turn was realized toward the ancient Greek models of art and literature. With the other elements from reality, which Byzantine art then received, it also accepted elements for the representation of space, and thus enriched its related ancient Hellenistic tradition.¹¹² This rebirth was continued and strengthened during the period of the Palaeologoi which likewise looked vigorously to the classical ideals. The realistic spirit of those years was also reflected in the representation of space and of the third dimension in general in the then contemporary Orthodox iconography, as we shall see below. From this period then the three-dimensional space was a usual thing in the wall-paintings as well as in the post-Byzantine portable icons, of which some are, for many reasons, more withdrawn to the related influence of Western art. But as it becomes clear from at least the best works of monumental painting, Or-

¹¹⁰ C. Kalokyris, *The Byzantine Wall-paintings*, illustr. XXI.

¹¹¹ Bettini, *op. cit.*, illustr. XXIV.

¹¹² As e.g. of Ravenna. See mosaics: Good Shepherd in the Mausoleum of Galla Placidia; Hospitality of Abraham in St. Vitalius.

thodox iconography succeeded in enrolling even the elements of space to its purely spiritual form and in assimilating it under its strong power of form.

Characteristic examples of space appearing in this way in iconography we have already from the 10th century as, for example, in the mosaic of the Child-holding and enthroned Theotokos between Constantine the Great and Justinian in the narthex of St. Sophia of Constantinople¹¹³ (foot-stool, throne, position of Emperors), in the mosaics of Daphni (Birth, Baptism, etc.), of Palermo (Capella Palatina: Birth, and others). Then there are many such examples in the wall-paintings of Sopotchani (as in the Koimesis), of Salonika (e.g. in the recently cleaned scenes in the church of St. Catherine), in the mosaics of the Monastery of Chora in Constantinople (as in the Census of Cyrenius) and in the wall-paintings of its chapel (as in the Healing of the Daughter of Jarius) in the already mentioned, on another occasion, Macedonian monuments (as e.g. those on Mount Athos), etc. Besides the monumental painting, the miniatures also of those exceptional manuscripts from the period of the Macedons (which copy the ancient painting) constitute more interesting examples.¹¹⁴

C. THE REALISTIC FORM IN ICONOGRAPHY

Presupposing whatever has been said before, we shall now examine the subject of the realistic form in our iconography, that is, the form and the significance which realism has in Orthodox art.

We have said at first that Orthodox iconography is an art purely idealistic, interested in the spiritual ideals and in the reality beyond this world. This truth is expressed by its artistic creations

¹¹³ Wittemore, *The Mosaics of St. Sophia at Istanbul*, p. 31.

¹¹⁴ See the codex Paris. Gr. 510 of the 9th century containing a collection of the Homilies of Gregory Nazianzus (vision of Hezekiah); especially the famous Greek Psalter 139 of the 10th century in the National Library of Paris (the sick Hezekiah, the crossing of the Red Sea); the Scroll of Joshua in the Vatican Library; 431 also of the 10th century; the Gospel 5 of the Iberians from the 13th century, and others. Cf. H. Omont, *Miniatures des plus anciens manuscrits Grecs de la bibliothèque nationale du VI^e au XIV^e siècle*, Paris, 1929, illustr. IX, XI, etc. Likewise (III) illustr. XX, XXVIII, XXXVI, LVIII, and K. Weitzmann, *Die byzantinische Buchmalerei des IX und X Jahrhunderts*, Berlin, 1953, and *The Joshua Roll—a Work of the Macedonian Renaissance*, Princeton, 1948.

from the first Christian years. Besides this, however, already from the earlier years, realism appeared in Christian iconography under the influence of Hellenistic art (Hellenistic branch of Christian art). This element became in it a means of expression; it served to make clear precisely the necessary subordination of the material to the spiritual, the worldly reality to the divine reality — a thing which Christian Faith considers as fundamental. Certainly the great concern of this art is directed to the world above the merely human things, but even so the present world constitutes for it something taken for granted. Also, man who has a mortal body and an immortal soul can partake of both worlds. Thus, just as religion is interested in both the reality of the world and in the reality of God, so also is art. Furthermore, art like religion places in the first degree the heavenly reality, in which τὸ πολίτευμα ἡμῶν ὑπάρχει (our citizenship is), but at the same time is not indifferent to the life in this world, which becomes a presupposition for the attainment of the heavenly life. Christ, moreover, and the saints participated in both worlds. They, of course, belong to the world of eternity, but through their historical existence they are also related to the present world. Thus, the elements of expressing the natural reality, that is, that which we call realism, are justifiably made from the beginning integral parts of iconography.

Orthodox iconographers have these things in mind when they represent the bodies of the saints and also the Lord Himself, who σὰρξ ἐγένετο (became flesh) and as God-Man completed His world-saving work. Moreover, the human form was essential in art because otherwise (as for example in utter symbolism or in intense abstraction) iconography would not have been understood by men. But the work and purpose of iconography was always not to represent the present reality in itself, but rather to be subordinated to the other, the true reality, by which it is ennobled and exalted. Thus, specifically, the body does not interest the painting of the Orthodox Church in its fine σωματική (somatic or bodily) meaning, but rather in its significance as ναός τοῦ Ἅγιου Πνεύματος (the temple of the Holy Spirit); that is to say, in that form in which spirituality shines and in such a representation in which it is proved that *truly in this body dwells the Holy Spirit* and is not the simple biological body deprived of Grace. Because of this presupposition, the body in our art preserves its ordinary characteristics of form, but these do not correspond to the so-

called pure naturalness, they are not rendered according to the strict naturalistic truth. The greater or lesser strictness in such a rendition depends upon that branch of Christian art which influences each time the iconography, or even upon the period to which it belongs (Macedons, Palaeologi, etc.), as we shall see below. Thus the form which the saints have in the works inspired by the Eastern branch of art, appear to be very little faithful to the natural reality. Here the personal truth and the natural moulding of the body are neglected. The contours are emphasized to offer an intensive expressiveness through the almond-shaped eyes designed large beyond proportion, and the stylized rendition of the other characteristics (ears, beard, etc.). Thus the figures appear naturally changed, deviating from the so-called natural beauty. Similarly, the sacred physiognomies do not appear with lively movements, they do not gesticulate, nor are they represented in the space engaged in a natural manner. Rather, they are simply arrayed in order, standing with the face forward in the undetermined, usually, gold or blue background of the compositions. Often the bodies appear unyielding just as the garments covering them.

By contrast to the above, in the works inspired by the Hellenistic branch of Christian art, the persons are rendered more naturally true because, instead of the vigorous contours and the intense stylization, the light-shadows dominate to characterize the plastic corporeality and to render the natural mass. Also the bodies are yielding and the foldings of the garments are organic to the sacred forms, which show here graceful positions, beautiful and harmonious movements.

But in Orthodox Byzantine iconography the works of the two mentioned branches are not usually presented clearly separated and distinguished from each other, because, as it is known, these influenced each other in the creation of the one Orthodox painting, which united harmoniously in itself both of these branches. This fusion into a unified form, in which the elements of both opposite branches were balanced, was accomplished by Byzantium through its Capital City — especially from the 7th century when the Arabs conquered the Hellenistic centers in the East. But as it often happens in the works of painting, despite the parallel co-existence, some elements of one of the two branches of art appear excelling or at other times entirely domineering. This means that the iconography of those works, for historical and other reasons,

underwent the direct and strong influence of the preponderant branch.¹¹⁵

After the Iconoclast controversy, of course, the ascetic ideals dominated in the art through the victorious monks. The iconographic type of the ascetic and the saint being formed at this time, despite the abstract expression and the profound spirituality, was a type which did not ignore the realism, as indicated, at least, by the intense leanness of the body, the thoughtful frown, the disorder of the hair and of the beard, and other such things.¹¹⁶

The turn to the Hellenistic sources during the period of the Macedons and the Comneni and of the whole climate of the renaissance under the same name is, of course, equivalent to the more realistic appearance of iconography. Thus, this art loves the beautiful heads, the round and healthy faces, the rosy shades of the flesh, the nobility and the sweetness of the eyes and, in one word, the graceful and the elegant, as we see in the miniatures of the manuscripts and in the monumental painting.¹¹⁷

The years of the Palaeologi with the lively rebirth of Hellenism and of antiquity¹¹⁸ are the years of the characteristic realism of Orthodox iconography. The iconographic types remind us often of forms of reality, to which the believer feels that he has a direct familiarity. Thus, e.g., saints, prophets, and hierarchs refer to revered forms of old men with the strong wrinkles of the faces, the expressive eyes, the aquiline noses, the dense eye-brows, the wide mustaches and the heavy beards. Women with the oval faces and the prominent cheekbones, or the round faces and the wide chins render analogous types of reality. Young faces and gentle angels presuppose ennobled young physiognomies, which were continually brought to the forefront by the research of the illustrated Hellenistic manuscripts. The portrait-realism is completed by the true movements and the ample gestures and even by the whole vigorous emotion of the physiognomies, which often reaches dramatic pathos. The pulsation of life vibrates also the

¹¹⁵ For example, the Eastern element — of the art of Syria and later of Cappadocia, etc.

¹¹⁶ Grabar, *La décoration byzantine*, Paris, Bruxelles, 1928, p. 19.

¹¹⁷ See e.g. the beautiful angel in the Vision of Ezekiel of the Codex Paris. Gr. 510 (9th century), *Omont, op. cit.*, LVIII. Cf. also the mosaics of Daphni in Millet, *Daphni*, illustrations.

¹¹⁸ Ch. Diehl, *La renaissance de l'art byzantin au XIV^e siècle*, in *Byzantium*, vol. II (1925), Paris, 1926, pp. 299 f.

many-person compositions, whose figures are connected by the successful correspondence of the gazes, of the inclinations of the heads and bodies, and the gesticulations—depicting artistically their sublime thoughts.

The realism is continued during the post-Byzantine years and especially in the portable icons, which are relatively influenced and from the Western Renaissance, even though the best of them harmonize this element with the Byzantine spiritual tradition.

During all the periods of Orthodox art, as mentioned above, the realistic element did not receive the primary position, which it received in the West. That is, as it has already become understood from this entire study, the realism in our iconography did not constitute a slavish imitation and a photographic rendition of living models and, generally, of the so-called natural reality. By its inclusion in the whole transcendent climate of Byzantine iconography—as verified from the beginning—the element of realism was *idealized* and *ennobled*, being changed into an element of high expression especially characteristic of Orthodox art. The point here is the *transformation* of the natural *reality* into a higher conception of form, as it also happens precisely, for example, in the best works of poetry and literature. Certainly, it is not necessary to say how much the philosophic disposition and the other theological sensitivity of the artist constituted the main source for such an artistic creation. In this art the believer has the sense of the material, which, however, has been essentially *transformed*,¹¹⁹ that is, it ἐνεδύθη τὴν ἀθανασίαν, (has put on immortality).¹²⁰ Looking at such sacred works, the believer feels the represented persons to be more familiar through their similarity to him, but, at the same time, he can understand the element of transcendence which constitutes their essential characteristic. This happens because in Orthodox painting we have a *supra-personal* realism, which receives its impetus from empirical things taken for granted, but which does so for the purpose of a more convenient understanding of the spirit of iconography by the faithful—through a more intense effect upon their senses. Thus, it does not constitute a specific copy of models such as is done by rule in the religious art of the West, as we have seen. The Orthodox iconographers, by approximating the sacred forms to us

¹¹⁹ Καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀλλαγησόμεθα (and we shall be changed), I Cor. 15:52.

¹²⁰ I Corinthians 15:54.

through the realistic element, succeeded by an amazing manner in not depriving these forms of their true spiritual nature, that is, of that element which truly is not ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (of this world). It may be said here, as already observed pertinently for worship,¹²¹ that in these works there is marvelous unity and harmony of "heaven and earth, eternity and time, grace and nature, spirit and flesh, symbol and reality." We may note as expressive examples the Macedonian wall-paintings (such as those of the Protaton, of the chapel of St. Efthemius at St. Demetrios' of Salonika, or Nerezi, of Gratchanitsa, and of Sopotchani), those of Constantinople (we mean those in the Monastery of Chora), those of Mystra (Metropolis, Peribleptos, Pantanassa) and those of many other churches.

In these monuments, while the realism of the faces often expresses an intense drama, the other elements of form are combined with it and fused in such an amazing manner that the spiritual reality remains the superior formative power to unite the opposite elements, to dominate and to bind all the elements of form. In the Burial Lament of Nerezi in Serbia (12th century), for example, the faces are full of life and dramatic truth, but the mould of the bodies, the order of the composition (see e.g. the hand of the Theotokos which comes rhythmically by its curve as a continuation of the circle of the nimbus of Christ), and of the foldings indicate the whole anti-realistic character of the art. In the garments again of the other Palaeologian monuments mentioned above, while one can verify the naturalness in the organic and flexible foldings, this is actually subordinated by the geometric order of the folds, to the transcendent style of Orthodox iconography. In the often mentioned Koimesis of the Theotokos in Sopotchani, we have again natural truth in the faces and in the foldings of the garments as well as in the third dimension of the space. However, the order which unites the figures to one another and orders them according to harmonious groups, the other-worldly expression of the gazes, and the high nobility of the movements and gestures denote the idealization of the composition and its exaltation above earthly things. Christ as twelve

¹²¹ Evangelos D. Theodorou, *The Instructive Value of the Triodeon in Use*, Athens, 1958, pp. 149-150. Cf. by the same author, Τὸ Ορθόδοξον Λειτουργικὸν καὶ Μυσταγωγικὸν Κήρυγμα (The Orthodox Liturgical and Mystagogical Sermon), Athens, 1960, p. 45.

years old in the wall-painting in the church of Bojana near Sofia (1259) has much natural beauty in the face, but by the entire plastic execution (see left eye) it received a dematerialized and other-worldly character.¹²²

By all these things mentioned above, we think, it becomes clear that our ecclesiastical painting attempted to express through the idealized realism the faith of the Church: that the saints, while they lived in the natural world, were through their whole virtuous struggle against evil made worthy of Divine Grace, which exalted and spiritualized their life on earth. Thus, the second icons must make perceptible through art this presence of the Grace of the Holy Spirit in the holy physiognomies; it is this Grace which ἐθέωσε (deified)¹²³ their material element and which, moreover, is inherent in the icons and acts through them. St. John Damascene, in his first oration on the icons, made a most characteristic induction: Οἱ γὰρ ἀγιοὶ καὶ ζῶντες πεπληρωμένοι ἦσαν πνεύματος ἀγίου καὶ τελευτησάντων αὐτῶν ἡ χάρις τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος ἀνεκφορτίτως ἔνεστι καὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς καὶ τοῖς σώμασιν ἐν τοῖς τάφοις, καὶ τοῖς χαρακτῆρσι καὶ ταῖς ἀγίαις εἰκόσιν αὐτῶν, οὐ κατ' οὐδίαν, ἀλλὰ χάριτι καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ, (For the saints were filled with the Holy Spirit even when living, and when they died the grace of the Holy Spirit is permanently descended upon their souls and upon their bodies in the graves, and in their characters *and in their holy icons*, not in essence, but in grace and energy.)¹²⁴

¹²² The painting of Bojana is attributed with certainty to an artist from Constantinople. See Grabar, *La décoration byzantine*, p. 37.

¹²³ See *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. XII, No. 2 (Winter 1966-1967), pp. 184-185, where this is discussed more generally. (Here we are limited to the case of the realistic form of saints.) Christ θεώσας τὸ πρόσλημα (deifying that which He received) (human nature) (See Vol. XII, No. 2, of this periodical, pp. 203-204) through His Incarnation, offered in His redemptive work the possibility for man to be united with God. (Cf. also Dionysius Areopagite, περὶ οὐρανίου ιεραρχίας (about the heavenly hierarchy), Migne P.G. 3, 376; θέωσις ἔστιν ἡ πρὸς Θεόν, ὡς ἐφικτόν, ἀφομοίωσίς τε καὶ ἔνωσις (theosis is the assimilation and union with God, as much as possible)).

¹²⁴ Migne, P.G. 94, 1249 f.

UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKE

Translated by PETER CHAMBERAS



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

August 14th, 1964, Morning Session.

THE LESSON OF HISTORY ON THE CONTROVERSY CONCERNING THE NATURE OF CHRIST

By ARCHBISHOP TIRAN NERSOYAN

The Lord Jesus Christ is perfect man and perfect God. He is the Logos incarnate, consubstantial with us as to his manhood and consubstantial with the Father as to his Godhood.

Both sides, Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian alike, agree to this confession of faith fully. They have always agreed to it since the Council of Nicaea. In the very grammatical structure of the sentence the subject denotes unity and the predicates denote duality. The word "perfect" closes the door to all quibble and prevarication. Both sides therefore accept, as a matter of course both unity and duality in Christ. One would think, off hand, that as an affirmation of faith and as a basis of unity this should be sufficient.

Yet the Fathers found that it was not enough. They felt, as the result of development of ideas on the subject, the need of erecting ramparts around the affirmation so that it could not be undermined by erroneous deductions and misrepresentations, and uncontrolled speculations could not do matricidal work by killing the central saving message of the affirmation, namely, the faith in the incarnation of the Son of God as man. Thus, in order to safeguard the core of the Christian message they used philosophical ideas to build up defenses around it.

Although I am not a specialist in matters of patristic theology, yet I would like to point out an important and significant precaution which the Fathers of both sides took when discussing the problems of Christology. They always said "we see," "we contemplate," "we recognize" two natures in Christ. The Lord is one, but He is seen, is made known in two or out of two. In other words, our determination about the nature or natures of Christ is conditioned by what we see in him when we look upon him acting during his earthly life. Some implied and some said outright that the Lord in His being and person had one nature but He was made known to us with characteristics, attributes pertaining to two different natures. They distinguished between what and who Christ

was in his own personal being and what He was seen and made known to be to the eyes of our human mind. The Fathers of both sides have been careful in making this distinction. But, alas, the point was lost on those who were quick to enter into the fray.

However, while the faith was firmly grounded in the Scriptures and in the Tradition in general, philosophical notions were not. It is well nigh impossible to make even bona fide philosophers agree. So, true to human nature, the disputants resorted to other means to secure agreements. For they knew that the unity of the Church was as important as the right affirmation of her faith. In fact they knew, as we know and should never forget, that the unity of the Church of Christ is inseparable from its orthodoxy.

We know also from history that those "other means" did not prove and could hardly be considered to be effective in securing the unity and orthodoxy of the Church. Emperors, courtiers, high placed ladies, turbulent monks, people ready to fish in troubled waters made the natural resolution of the problems impossible. They forced the hand of time and history. The history of the Eastern Church within itself, the history of the Eastern Church vis-à-vis the Western Church, the history of the Western Church within itself prove without a shadow of doubt the failure of those "other means" to secure the unity and the orthodoxy of the Church in its wholeness.

How do we get out of the difficulty? How can we resolve the impasse? Can we recover the unity of the Church by having recourse to the old methods? Can we come to agreements by philosophical determinations on matters that concern the faith?

Before referring to the perennial answer to this question, first formulated by Vincent of Lerin ("unity in essentials, freedom in things dubious and charity in all"), an answer which has not been taken at face value, and therefore has always been tabled because of the difficulty of drawing a line between the essentials and the doubtful, let me make another remark.

Churches and their theologians have fought their battles in the field of Christian philosophy or theology for a good purpose, no doubt. They have had legitimate motives and commendable zeal. That purpose was to defend the faith against the inroads of heretical speculations which if not checked would cause the decomposition and disintegration of the deposit of the faith. This kind of battle is part of the task of the Christian teacher.

But we know, as a matter of historical record, that often these battles fail to serve their purpose and are inconclusive. Not only because of the frailty of the human mind in the teacher and in the taught, but also because one or the other side in the dispute — and here I am referring to the Christological controversy — waned or waxed depending on the accidental factors and forces which were brought to bear upon the problem. The accession of one or other emperor on the Byzantine throne was paramount in deciding which side would have the upper hand. So eventually each side withdrew to its camp, built its own defenses and waited, and presumably has been waiting, in our case since the 7th century, for the so-called heresy to work out the destruction of the Church in the opposing camp.

Yet for fifteen centuries we have lived and worked, each side with its own so-called heresy or orthodoxy, as the case may be, and lo and behold, we still maintain that Christ is perfect man and perfect God, and the central affirmations of our common faith, nay, even the peripheral affirmations thereof are not found to be contradictory. The faith of either side has not really been impaired to any degree by our so-called heresies and none of the dire results that were anticipated has come about. In fact when we come to think of it, we are even embarrassed to find ourselves in seemingly opposing camps. Not only are we good Christians, albeit sinful, but we are good orthodox Christians, speaking non-technically, as it were. The supposedly poisonous heresies have produced no deleterious effects on the general health of our Christian faith and the overall orthodoxy of our churches. The conclusion cannot be escaped that neither the teaching of one nature nor the teaching of two natures has made a difference in the real orthodoxy of the Church or in the operation of the Holy Spirit therein. Can we say, perhaps, that the very exercise of our intellectual muscles has kept us on both sides fairly trim and healthy?

What better proof can we have for the contention that our bitter theological quarrels were not really so terribly necessary after all, even though normal and calm discussions could not be dispensed with. And if some people had not been so terribly intent to use the Church for their own non-theological purposes, the quarrels would not have been so tumultuous and sometimes so disastrous, when they did take place.

Let me nevertheless say this, that if I had lived in the fifth or in the sixth century I would have said that the fight could

not be avoided. I would have considered the issues so vital that I would have engaged myself in the thick of the battle for the sake of my Lord.

Before I came here I read for a second time the full treatise of Timothy Aeluros against the Chalcedonians. This treatise was used as teacher's guide to orthodox theology among non-Chalcedonians. I am referring to "the Polemics" of Timothy, the Pope of Alexandria, written during the sixties of the 5th century when he was in exile in Cherson, and translated into Armenian some twenty years later and published in 1912 from an ancient manuscript of the 10th century, that contains the whole of the text, some 320 pages. I could not help being moved by the man's plea, made with sincerity, conviction and competence, in the style of the Fathers of the Church of his time. And I venture to say that Chalcedonians will have a difficult time to find fault with the arguments. Timothy quotes Dioscorus, his predecessor, who says: "I know full well, having been brought up in the faith, that the Lord has been begotten of the Father as God and that the same has been begotten of Mary as man. See him walking on the earth as man and creator of the heavenly hosts as God; see him sleeping in the boat as a man and walking on the seas as God; see him hungry as man and giving food as God; see him thirsty as man and giving drink as God; see him stoned by Jews as man and worshipped by angels as God; see him tempted as man and driving demons away as God, and similarly of many other instances." He says again: "God the Logos consubstantial with the Father at the end of the ages became consubstantial with man in the flesh for our redemption, remaining what he was before." I quoted this passage out of many similar ones, found in the writings of Timothy, only to show how much he is in agreement with the positive aspects of the teaching of the Council of Chalcedon. He almost sounds like Leo, except where the latter personalizes the two natures of Christ and merely conjoins the divine Logos and the man Jesus, saying further that one of the two natures is he who died and the other is he who did not die. Yet notwithstanding some of the unfortunate expressions found in the Tome, the non-Chalcedonians can perhaps explain the Tome of Leo in the light of the positive statements of the Council on which there was and there is, I hope, substantial agreement all round. Perhaps we can take the Tome as a theological document sent to the Churches by the Council of Chalce-

don for study, even if this is the modern manner of speaking of the World Council of Churches. For we have to recognize that the bitter quarrel arose really not because of the substance of the Chalcedonian definition but because of the Tome which the Council was constrained to adopting in toto on the insistence of the imperial commissioners. After all, the non-Chalcedonians would not overlook the fact that the Fathers in Chalcedon reversed themselves completely so soon after the Council of 449. We must not fail to pay its due to human frailty, even though we believe that the Holy Spirit speaks through the Church and Divine Providence ultimately guides its course through history.

We have now fourteen centuries behind us. We can now see that the fears of the men of the fifth century did not prove to be well founded after all. In the course of these fourteen centuries, after the endless and bitter incriminations, struggles, tragedies, catastrophes, we have arrived nowhere in our efforts to secure the unity of the Church. The fact that after ages of discussion and debate, seasoned with insults and invectives, we still are there where we were at the beginning of the engagement, proves that the mystery must remain what it is — a mystery stated in its naked form. Is it not time for this generation to realize that the methods used by our forefathers were not the right ones for the attainment of their goal?

The methods employed in these remote centuries were not always chosen deliberately, sincerely, singlemindedly with the ultimate goal in view. The charity of the protagonists in the disputes was overshadowed by their zeal for the defense of the theological form of their orthodoxy.

To be sure, events happen in history with valid reasons grounded in the realities of a given situation. And powers, sometimes divine and sometimes, alas, demonic propel men and things forward. Yet we cannot eliminate accidents which divert history from its course. Who knows, perhaps we are committed to our several theological positions because of legacies we inherit from history that is full of accidents or the result of a series of accidents that have happened during the turbulent life of the Church? Should we not be mindful of this possibility and re-evaluate our positions accordingly, giving free rein, unobstructed rein to the Holy Spirit in our minds and souls?

Perhaps the defense mechanisms of peoples on each side of the battle lines in the fifth and sixth centuries operated in order

to ensure their security in realms other than purely theological or even credal. All kinds of fears, real or imaginary, wind the springs of the life of peoples. Social, economic, cultural, political factors pinned each side to its own battle grounds. No Syrian or Armenian was going to become Greek by accepting the emperor's dubious orthodoxy and thereby being incorporated in his Church. No Egyptian was going to be subservient to an emperor across the seas who was always despoiling him of his crops. No Syrian or Armenian was willing to be subjected to severities by the great Shah of Iran for being on good terms and in the same church with the new Romans of the West. Conversely no Greek was to be indifferent to the alienation of the Western lands in Europe from the Empire or to the influx in force of foreigners throughout the length and breadth of its ancient patrimony, which would happen, he must have felt, if he allowed the orthodoxy of non-Chalcedonians.

Our fierce but great and adorable Fathers of the Church acted well in the roles which Providence assigned to them. They were beset and gripped by anxieties in the face of the paradoxical demands of their faith upon their vaunted rationalism. They fought with desperation to escape into pretensions of comprehension of the central mystery of the Christian faith, namely the union of God and man in one unique person.

But we must come back to our times and to our question. Can we, should we necessarily agree on determinations that are primarily within the realm of Christian philosophy, that is to say theology, which is the philosophical systematization of the explanations of the deposit of the Faith?

Past experience should make us doubt that we can. Except if we agree to disagree on matters that concern the foliage of the tree of the faith, so that the tree can blow and flourish in a free atmosphere, so that its tender shoots can bend wherever the Spirit hits them.

Let us thank God that we agree on the fundamentals. Let us also thank God that the wound which was opened on the Body of Christ has not deepened beyond healing in the course of long centuries. On the contrary it is showing signs of healing. Let us co-operate with the Lord in quickening the process of healing. And we can do that if we leave the theologians free to discuss philosophical problems related to the faith and explaining the faith. Let us leave them free to enlighten our way while we

march in the united Church along the royal road. As a matter of fact, when we come to think of it, we now do leave theologians free to express their opinions, and they are not too much afraid of being anathematized and exiled. For if we had followed the style of former centuries we would have to convene General Church Councils every so often to examine and pass on the writings and preachings of as many theologians as are daring enough to publish theological treatises with an open and inquiring mind; and with the laudable purpose of explaining the faith in terms of the patterns of thought of their own present generation. Let us leave confession and explanation separate, so far as it is possible and practicable.

And let us be mindful of the fact that our disagreements do not cover much ground on the vast field of Christian doctrine. Is it not significant that the one problem which is engaging us today is this question, undoubtedly important, of the nature controversy. Many other questions, large and small, on which at one time or another there was disagreement in the Church have disappeared or have been outdated. Our past disagreement on the meaning and application of the term "nature" should melt away and lose its significance in the extensive area of our mutual agreements on all other matters of faith. The intellectual atmosphere of our age cannot bear disputes in the style of the fourth, fifth or the sixth centuries, even though we stand in an immeasurable debt specially to the great church fathers of those centuries. And it seems to me that if we leave their style behind us, the quarrels also will be left behind. For we do not in fact feel, think and speak or work in the style of the patristic age. And as soon as we translate the style of their language of theology into our own language of the present age, we shall see that the dispute on the two natures will lose its form and therefore its old urgency.

Can we make that translation? This is the great question — the question of the relevance of ancient patterns of thought into our present world-outlook and manner of thinking.

The problem which the Fathers debated was, essentially, the problem of the relationship between the spiritual and the temporal, between heaven and earth, between God and man. This problem, to be sure, is an eternal problem. We discuss this problem now everyday, but we do not thereby rock the boat of the Church as they did of old. I dare say we will not even disagree too much on the question among ourselves.

Furthermore, any harmful element which a theologian of our present age might suspect there lurks in one or other formula, Chalcedonian or non-Chalcedonian, will be of no effect in a united communion. Even if, I say if, there is a trace of poison in one or other formula, it will produce no bad effects on our spiritual health in a united communion. The Church will march on, notwithstanding any predelection which one or other theologian might have for this or that form of asserting the unity of Christ in his divinity and manhood.

After all, we recognize the tree by its fruits. And when I quote the Lord's words I have no intention of appearing facile or philistine. That divine dictum has an extremely important bearing on the problem we have come to discuss. The tree of the Church grown on Chalcedonian soil and the tree of the Church grown on non-Chalcedonian soil have both given good fruits, so far as those fruits go. As I have already mentioned, fourteen full centuries have proved that. And proof given by history is the proof of life itself, not the hollow proof of syllogisms or philosophical speculations. Why should we continue to be suspicious of the quality of the seed or of the tree when the fruits are there?

Let us, therefore, leave the problem of Christology on the specific point of the nature or natures of the Lord for free discussion and communication *within* a united communion. Our sense of mission and apostolate towards our peoples and towards the world should not allow us to insist on conformism on the basis of one or other formula, where conformism is not really necessary.

In a united communion each of our churches will live and work as before, trying as best as it can to bring the message of the Gospel to its own people. We shall only stop calling each other names and will consider each other as being orthodox after exchanging irenical declarations of confession. It is a deeply rooted policy of all Eastern Churches that each people, that has its own culture, language, rite, particular canons, national character developed in the course of its history, shall govern itself independently of others, except when they are faced with common problems that require common solutions, as in the days of the undivided Church.

I believe it to be true to facts when I say that our division has reduced itself to being merely formal and not real from a dogmatic point of view. I believe I am justified in standing among you and saying that no Eastern churchman can in good faith con-

sider another Eastern churchman, bona fide subscribing to the teachings of his church, be he Chalcedonian or non-Chalcedonian, to be an heretic in reality. I want to say again that heresy is bad because it endangers the faith, it causes progressive deviation from the right path to salvation and to the kingdom of God. But now, after the famous Council, we, Greeks, Egyptians, Syrians, Armenians, Russians, Indians, Ethiopians and others, are at least as near each other in real orthodoxy as we were prior to the Council. And when I say the Council I include in it the remaining three of the seven, for they were only part of the fourth.

It is always good for the church to regurgitate theological problems of days gone by. It is profoundly important that we must never let the Fathers get out of our system. On the other hand, while we are, as orthodox, committed to the sense of the Scriptures, to the Word of God, to the deposit of the faith in the church, to the teachings of the Fathers, to the apostolic tradition, yet we are not committed to the philosophical tools which the Fathers used to explain the faith. Can we disentangle the two, confession and explanation? We can and as a matter of fact we do. We do not accept, for example, the cosmogonies and cosmologies of the Fathers, or of the Scriptures for that matter. Even Jesuits recognize that the creation stories of the Genesis are mythological in form. Most of us believe in evolution. Have we abandoned the Fathers in doing this? I think not. In order to be a good Christian do we have to choose between Platonists and Aristotelians? I think not. Hypothetically speaking, if I can use even logical positivism as a tool for the defense of my orthodox faith, I will not hesitate to do so, without of course committing myself to its atheism. There are Christian existentialists and atheist existentialists. The fact that we are trying to find out what the Fathers meant by the word "nature" shows that we agree on the sense of the Fathers. So let us all agree on the sense and leave physiology and the enumeration of natures alone, or rather let us use both indifferently as the Fathers and St. Cyril did in fact before the Council. Let us take the word nature meaning the qualities or the mode of being of the person as a whole and then say one, or take it as meaning the divine qualities or the mode of being of the person of Christ and His human qualities or the mode of being separately, and say two. As a matter of fact, both sides will be safer if we both use both forms. This sounds all too Zenonian. But it is not, because we are in the

twentieth century and as I tried to explain above, much water has passed under the bridge in the meantime.

Let us learn and be learned by all means, but let us at the same time march with the times and with our feet firmly gripping the realities of our situation.

DISCUSSION: Concerning the Paper of Archbishop Tiran

BISHOP EMILIANOS: Theology is more than philosophical speculation. It belongs to the essence of the Church. We cannot disparage it so lightly.

FATHER BOROVOV: I am happy with the spirit of the paper. The details and specific expressions we can discuss. But if we take the direction recommended by the paper, we must also keep in mind the distinction between *theologoumena* and *philosophoumena*. Different schools can use different philosophical terminology, but we must be one in our dogma.

PROFESSOR MEYENDORFF: The content of faith cannot be compromised. We cannot afford to become indifferent to dogma.

ARCHBISHOP TIRAN: I agree of course with Fr. Meyendorff. All I want to say is that the explanation of established dogma has to be brought up to date.

FATHER ROMANIDES: It is very important to distinguish the basic intuition and vision of faith from the role of philosophy in theology. Serious mistakes can be made in this regard. In our common Alexandrian-Cappadocian tradition the nature of the use of theological and philosophical terms is to be understood as an expression of the faith in the modern idiom of any age, having first adjusted the meaning of terms to serve the Church's kerygma. The Church can never accept any philosophical idiom as a means of *understanding* and *comprehending* the faith as happened with the Augustinian and Antiochene traditions and as still happens today within Roman Catholic and Protestant theological circles. The Church uses philosophy in order to make herself understood, but never in order to understand herself.

It is important to note the fact that doctrinally Chalcedon was not a reversal of the Ephesine Council of 449 since Eutyches was exonerated on the basis of his acceptance, sincerely or hypocritically, of the double consubstantiality of Christ. This Council was rejected by Chalcedon because of its handling of the cases of Flavian, Eusebius, and Eutyches and because it completely ignored Leo, having realized from the content of his Tome that the bishop of Rome did not understand the nature of the Christological problems debated in the East. The bishops at Chalcedon were generally the very same ones who took part in the Ephesine Council of 449. It is unrealistic to believe that they felt that they were doctrinally reversing themselves at Chalcedon. The manner in which they handled Leo's Tome is proof of their doctrinal stability.

It seems that one of our basic problems is to get a better and historically accurate understanding of what happened to the reconciliation of 433. The question which faces us is why this terminological agreement collapsed. Perhaps we should study the effects the alliance between Leo and Theodoret had on the Alexandrians between the Ephesine Council of 449 and Chalcedon.

PROFESSOR NISSIOTIS: We must distinguish between the intention of this paper and what it actually proposes. The nature of the Incarnation is a mystery, but not necessarily irrational. It is a mystery which can be communicated, though imperfectly. And the terminology has significance for the revealed truth itself. The discarding of old terminology does not solve the problem but creates new problems. There is a deposit not only of faith, but also of the means of expression, even in the Scriptures. *Physis, hypostasis, prosopon* are all New Testament terms.

PROFESSOR FLOROVSKY: I was also moved by the spirit of Archbishop Tirán's paper. I am also for peace and reconciliation. But I must disagree with the sharp distinction between faith or confession and philosophy. Faith or confession requires philosophy. We must be fair to our Fathers. These Fathers had conviction and we must come to terms with the convictions and not merely with the terms.

The style of the *Patristic* age cannot be abandoned. That is the only solution for contemporary theology. There is no one modern idiom which can unite the Church.

PROFESSOR KONIDARIS: Our discussion has been most fruitful here. But we have a responsibility to be faithful to the Fathers and the Councils. The very essence of our faith requires this faithfulness to all the seven Councils.

FATHER SAMUEL: The details of the Archbishop's paper should not be pressed. His main intention should however be taken seriously.

ARCHBISHOP TIRÁN: Terms are in constant flux, and there is a limit beyond which their meaning cannot be fixed. The Nicene discussion was not simply terminological. The question was whether Christ was God or not. It was a clear choice. In Chalcedon there was no such clear issue. It was, as all of us here agree, mainly a terminological dispute, with agreement in essentials. We must not put the two debates at the same level.

On the method of achieving intercommunion, I would like to say quite frankly that for our Churches it would be difficult to accept Chalcedon beforehand without qualification and explanations. It would be difficult to accept Chalcedon in a manner in which its acceptance would appear as a brusque reversal of position and admission of long-standing error. But if intercommunion is first restored, then the atmosphere will be cleared and a situation will be created among our churches where it will be easy and natural to agree with what a sister church has agreed to in order to safeguard the faith in accordance with the teachings of the Fathers.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

THE MYSTERY OF THE INCARNATION

By THE VERY REV. LIKE SULTANAT HABTE MARIAM WORQUINEH

The question of how the divine and the human natures are united in Christ has been a stumbling-block to some churches. But the fact is that the Incarnation, namely that God the Son united to Himself manhood, is indeed a divine mystery. It is clear that the two natures of Godhead and manhood are perfectly united and that Christ is thus one Person and one Nature from two Natures.

The one holy, catholic and apostolic Church had, from the beginning, held to this great mystery concerning the Incarnation. But from the fourth century there arose heretics who tried to spread erroneous ideas. Some, for instance, maintained that Christ was only human. Others taught the other extreme and denied His humanity. Apollinarius affirmed that He had no human soul. There were also others who insisted on the unity of His Person, but divided His Natures. Some others, while affirming the union of the two Natures and even granting His Nature to be one, spoke of two Natures. There were also men like Eutyches for whom one of the two Natures was lost in the other.

The holy Church, while keeping to the orthodox faith, anathematized the heretics. But unfortunately the Council of Chalcedon in 451 became the cause of division of the one Church into two, the reason being political rather than dogmatic. There was in fact a question of dogma involved in that division, but it was not really fundamental, and the parties could have come to an agreement by accepting the teaching of St. Cyril of Alexandria, our common father, who had maintained that Christ was "One incarnate nature of God the Word." In opposing Nestorius and his followers St. Cyril had shown that it was impossible to speak of Christ that He was in two natures after the union. The famous teaching of the Evangelist John that "the Word became flesh" (John 1:14) signified the divine mystery of the union and the unity of Christ's Person and Nature. By the union of the natures in the Incarnation, the two natures became one nature, the natures being united without separation, without confusion, and without change. Thus He was perfect God and perfect man. While testifying to this mystery, St. Peter says, He "died in the

flesh, but was quickened by the spirit" (1 Peter 3:18). This shows that neither of the two natures was assimilated by the other, but that the properties of the Divine Word were attributed to the flesh and those of the flesh to the Divine Word.

However, this division of the Church has been overemphasized in Christian literature and thus many have been fighting each other in words accusing one another of heresy. When the two parties got together in a synod nothing good was settled by the synod except for some disturbance and this is shown by the minutes and the decisions of the synod. But it is clear from the minutes of Chalcedon that St. Dioscorus was not anathematized on the ground of heresy. From our side also there were some who called the synod a council of dogs (Abba Giorgis) and rejected it. The main reason for this division of the church was political. Besides, there was great misunderstanding between the two groups in regard to the philosophical terminologies such as hypostasis, physis and ousia, which had caused disputes between the two schools of Alexandria and Antioch.

There have been in our country (Ethiopia) two types of heretics who, without understanding deeply the mystery of the Incarnation, have denied the perfect union of the two natures, in Christ, and the truth that He is perfect man and perfect God. In fact, these heretics have their origin in the heresies of the 3rd and 4th centuries. They are (1) *Tsegga*, (*The Adoptionist or the "Son of Grace" view*). They teach that Christ is not by nature the Son of God. But He is God or the Son of God only by the Grace of God or by adoption. Until His baptism Jesus was an ordinary man. At his baptism, He received the gift of God and thus He became the Son of God only by grace. These heretics had gathered many followers and caused great troubles in the country. (2) *Kibat* (*The Sons of the Chrism*). These have the same teaching as those mentioned above. A Prince is anointed to become king or a prophet in the O.T. for one can be anointed to receive the gift of prophecy. In the same way Christ became God or the Son of God by the anointing (gift) of the Holy Spirit. That is why He was called "Christ," the "Kibu" (the anointed). These two groups of adoptionists spread their teachings in many parts of the country. Thus the one church of Ethiopia was divided into three groups who fought each other for a long time during the 16th century. But eventually truth became the winner and

thus the ancient and official orthodox faith was strengthened (MEDBELE HAIMANOT).

These two groups who taught that Christ was only man had their origin in the heresies of the 2nd and 3rd centuries. However, if they look carefully over the Holy Scriptures, they would be sure of the divinity of Christ. St. Paul speaks of Him as follows: ". . . who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God. But made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the likeness of man" (Phil. 2:6-7). St. John also, speaking of His divinity says: "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." He says also: "The Word was made flesh" by which he testifies to the mystery of Incarnation. The Ethiopian Orthodox Fathers, based upon the Holy Scriptures, have preserved for us the right teaching of the true faith.

The Ethiopian Orthodox Church accepts the two natures united (in union) and thus, in order to distinguish her from the above-mentioned heretics, it took for herself a distinctive name (The Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahido bete-Christian) i.e. The Ethiopian Orthodox Union Church, that is to say, the church which accepts the perfect union of the two natures in Christ and which believes that Christ is perfect man and perfect God.

THE TEACHING OF THE ETHIOPIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH ABOUT ONE NATURE

The Second of the three divine Persons is God the Son. Since God the Son is the only-begotten Son of the Father, He is called the Son of God (Heb. ch. 1), and as He is the Father's word He is called the Word of God (John 1/1-14). He is called Jesus because He is the saviour. As He is the anointed king or Messiah He is called Christ. Taking our nature and carrying our judgment on Himself, He saved us maintaining for ever His union with us. Therefore He is called Emmanuel (Ias. 7:14). He is the Creator of our body and soul. He is our master who delivered us from the bondage to the Devil, and thus He is called Lord. Likewise He has many other attributes which befit His natures, essence and work. God the Son as Person is sent of God, His specific name is Son and as such He is begotten. The Son is born of the Father before the creation of the world; that is, He is born of the same person and the same substance of the Father. Begotten

not made, He is perfect God, coequal and consubstantial with the Father in His Divinity. Through Him came all things into being. Nothing was made without Him (Creed of the Apostle John 1:3. 1 Cor. 1:30). St. Paul also testifies to the divinity of the Son as follows: "Now unto the king eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen" (1 Tim. 1:17). He (the Son) is Light from Light, Very God from Very God. He is the first, none is prior and superior to Him. He is the first and the last. He is alpha and omega.

When the fulness of the time came, He revealed Himself in our flesh and became man like us. He did all things that man does with the exception of sin (John 8:46. 11 Cor. 5:21). And at the same time He was with the Father and the Holy Spirit, and did not abandon His throne because He was truly God. As absolutely true man He walked on the earth with us and accomplished all the works of man, and by this His humanity was shown. Christ means the anointed (Messiah). In Him Godhood and manhood, referred to as two natures, are united without separation, without confusion and without change and become one. The name "Christ" is the designation of this perfect union of the two natures, and is not only of the human or only of the divine. By this perfect union Christ became one person instead of two persons and one nature instead of two natures. So He is perfect man and perfect God. He is always praised as the Son of God and as the Son of man, or as God-man. In His incarnation the Son of God was not separated from His Father and from the Holy Spirit, but was ever with them. The Son of God is the true way of life, and through Him the believers are restored from death to life.

Therefore, we believe that Jesus Christ, our Lord, is true God from true God, begotten from the Father before the creation of the world. For us and for our salvation He became incarnate and was perfect man. He took the human nature fully without any addition or any subtraction. As He was begotten from His Father, He is perfect God and is co-equal and consubstantial with the Father in His Godhead. No imperfection is found in His humanity. He is perfect man like us. He is perfectly united with us, the union being from the two natures into one nature and from two modes of life into one. This union took place without any change, confusion and division. This happened through the divine power and mystery. After the union of the divine and

human natures we do not speak of the two persons nor of the two natures, but of one person, one nature and one will. So we worship one Lord, one God and one Jesus with His Father and the Holy Spirit (creed). The union of the Divine Word with the flesh took place in the womb of the Virgin Mary. The Divine person with the human person on the one hand, and the Divine nature with the human nature on the other hand were united perfectly. This is testified by St. Cyril as follows: "We believe in the incarnate Word revealed in one nature."

The union which took place in the womb is a perfect union. And this St. John has testified saying: "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." In the same way, we can say that flesh also was made divine. Thus the attributes of the flesh can be given to the Divine Word and vice versa. However, the properties of each nature are preserved without any change after the union. Therefore, we believe that Christ is one person and one nature, and this is both divine and human. We speak of one because of the union. That is to say, the human person and the human nature being united with the divine person and divine nature, became one person and one nature. We strongly anathematize those who say that Christ's humanity was absorbed or swallowed up in His Divinity and thus Christ has only one person and one nature. But we say that the two natures are united without change.

The mystery of the union of humanity and divinity or the mystery of one nature and one person was shown in many soteriological works of Christ. Christ, in whom humanity and divinity were united in one person and one nature, was crucified on the cross. The Divine Word without being united with the flesh cannot be crucified, because as God He is beyond suffering. But through the union with the flesh He was crucified and was subjected to death. If, on the other hand, only the human body was crucified He could not save the world. Many were crucified, but it is only Christ who has saved the world. What wonder if Christ was crucified and died in the flesh! "While thou wast nailed on the cross, Thou didst not depart from Thy throne and didst not separate from Thy Father and Thy Holy Spirit" said St. Heracles. When we speak of Christ crucified we have to believe that both His humanity and divinity were present on the cross, because as we said above, the Logos unless united with the flesh cannot be crucified, and the flesh, without being united with the Divine

Logos, could not save the world. "Thou art in heaven with the Father and at the same time Thou art on the cross crucified. Thou who dost not suffer in Spirit (Divinity) hast suffered in flesh." The Deity, who does not suffer, had suffered on the cross because of His union with the flesh. When the weak and mortal flesh was crucified it could give salvation to the world because of its union with the immortal Deity. Death is the property (attribute) of humanity and life is that of the Deity (Divinity), but through the union the property of the flesh is given to the Divine Word and vice versa. Thus we say: He who does not die died on the cross. St. Peter also speaking of the mystery of the union says: "[Christ] died in the flesh but was quickened by the Spirit." He who "died" is the divine Word which is united with the immortal Divine Word. St. Paul explained this saying: "We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son" (Romans 5:10).

When Christ died, as He was perfect man, He separated His blessed soul from His body by His own power. However, His divinity was in the grave with the flesh and also in Hades with His soul. It is only His soul that separated from His flesh, but His divinity was with both His flesh and soul. Divinity never separates from the flesh and flesh also never separates from the Divinity. It will be wherever the Divinity will be. Because of the perfect union both were subject to death. Philalethes has explained this as follows: "When the soul separated from the flesh, Divinity did not separate either from flesh or soul (which is separated from flesh)."

When the Son of God was in the grave in the flesh at the same time that flesh united with the Divinity was ruling the world sitting at the right hand of God the Father. "Thou stayed in the grave while Thou wast upon the Cherubim. Thou wast dead for three days while Thou wast living with the Father and the Holy Spirit."

THE WAY TO UNITY

It is necessary that all of us who believe in Christ should have the same teaching and walk on the same road. We can speak of one Christ, one Church and one Baptism only when we follow the same principle and are united in holding to the same confession. Otherwise we divide the one and indivisible Christ and the one universal Church into many sects. And thus we give occasion for non-Christians to criticize severely the Christian Church and its principles. Even during the time of the Apostles there

was division among the believers, though they did not have any dogmatic differences. Some claimed to be of Paul, some of Cephas and some of Apollos. St. Paul, the teacher of the Gentiles, had rightly condemned this tendency and said: "Is Christ Divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Why such a division? . . ." If we now believe that Christ is perfect man and perfect God, and that He is our only Saviour, we hold the fundamental truth of the Christian faith and all other notions are nothing but a cause for division. When we say that Christ is one nature, we do not mean that either of the two natures is assimilated by the other, but we say one nature only to stress the perfect union of the two natures and to condemn the Nestorian heresy of dividing the one Christ into two natures. Those also who believe that Christ is in two natures do accept and believe the perfect union of the two natures. In this case the difference is only in words, not in essence, because we all believe in the perfect union. Christ is one *hypostasis* and one nature because of the union, and thus He is perfect man and perfect God. Because of the union with the flesh, His divinity was the subject of all the human works. Because of its union with the divine nature, the flesh was the subject of all the divine works.

If this emphasis is accepted, there is no place for division. The two natures can never be separated but they are eternally united and we believe in this perfect union. Whatever Christ worked was the work of both natures in union. Neither the flesh nor the divine Word acts separately, i.e. it is wrong to say the former performs only human acts and that the latter only what is divine. We do not say that flesh works only the works of the flesh and that the divine Word works only the works of the Word. In other words, we do not speak of two natures or energies after the union, but we say that Christ is one, God and man at the same time.

However, fundamentally we have the same teaching and the same belief, and therefore, we should not thus remain separated from each other only because of some complicated philosophical terms and conceptions. We are anxiously looking forward to the time when all churches would become one affirming the same faith. Those who work hard for the union of the churches are worthy of praise. Nowadays we need as many people as possible to labor for the rediscovery of the Church's ever-existing unity. It is our sincere wish and prayer that all the leaders of the Churches would work hard for the realization of Church Unity.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

August 12th, 1964, Afternoon Session.

ONE INCARNATE NATURE OF GOD THE WORD

By THE REV. PROFESSOR V. C. SAMUEL

I. INTRODUCTION

The Person of Jesus Christ transcends so much our comprehension and linguistic expression that no formulation is adequate to describe Him. At the same time, the Church has adopted certain statements thereby setting a limit beyond which we should not go in our theological reflection with reference to His Person, although there is disagreement between the Chalcedonian and the non-Chalcedonian Churches on the question of what these statements are.¹ Even here the crucial difference between the two traditions of Churches may be said to lie in the attitude of each towards the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word." Thus on the whole the Western Churches are rather suspicious of this phrase. But in the East, while the Byzantine Orthodox Church is in favour of accepting it in a sort of partial way, the non-Chalcedonian Orthodox Church of the East regards it as a central linguistic tool to affirm the mystery of the Incarnation.

That the phrase came originally from Apollinarian forgeries ascribed to Athanasius of Alexandria is vigorously upheld by many modern scholars.² Even if this view be granted, it does not follow

¹ The non-Chalcedonian tradition accepts the "Nicene Creed," the Second Letter of Cyril to Nestorius, the Third Letter of Cyril to Nestorius with the Twelve Anathemas, and the Letter of Cyril to the Easterns, otherwise known as the Formulary of Reunion. It also accepts the theology of the *Henotikon* as orthodox. In the Chalcedonian tradition, many of the Western Churches are rather half-hearted in their acceptance of Cyril's Third Letter to Nestorius with the Anathemas, and no Church either in the East or in the West thinks much of the *Henotikon*. All the Chalcedonian Churches accept the *Tome of Leo* and the Chalcedonian formula of the Faith, both of which are rejected by the non-Chalcedonian body.

² For a summary treatment of this point, see R. V. Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies* (London, 1954), p. 89, esp. n. 2. Panagiotis N. Trempela, «Δογματικὴ τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας» (Athens, 1959), vol. II, p. 98. The present writer has not had a chance to examine the basis on which this view has been put forward by modern scholars. So his acceptance of it is only provisional.

that therefore the phrase should be discarded. For the crucial phrase in the Nicene Creed, namely "of the same substance with the Father" (*ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ* or *shewa bousia labo*), had not only a pagan origin,³ but it had also been condemned by the Council of Antioch in 268 which excommunicated Paul of Samosata.⁴ Therefore, the unorthodox origin of a term cannot be cited as an argument against its adoption by Orthodox theology, so long as the meaning assigned to it is orthodox and there is need for pressing that meaning. Cyril of Alexandria, the great bulwark of orthodoxy against the teaching of the Nestorian school in the fifth century,⁵ saw in the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word" a most crucial linguistic tool to conserve the Church's faith in the Person of Jesus Christ.

However, like the Nicene phrase "of the same substance with the Father" which came to be misunderstood and misconstrued by various men for a long time, the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word" also was given different shades of erroneous meanings by men in olden times. Before taking up these heretical ideas for a brief discussion, it is necessary to look into the question of Eutyches.

II. THE TEACHING OF EUTYCHES

The question as to what precisely were the ideas held by Eutyches is not easy to be answered. Two sets of statements made by him at the Home Synod of Constantinople in 448 are certainly to be considered confused, if not heretical.⁶ Thus in the first place, when he was asked whether he would affirm that our Lord was "of the same substance with us" (*ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν* or *Shewa bousia lan*), he answered in this way: "Since I confess my God to be the Lord of heaven and earth, I have not till this day let myself en-

³ G. L. Prestige has shown in his *God in Patristic Thought* (London, 1952), p. 197, that Valentinians had used the phrase "homoousios."

⁴ In defending the Council of Nicea, both Athanasius and Hilary of Poitiers acknowledge this fact and proceed to answer the problem derived from it.

⁵ The fact that there are a number of modern scholars who are critical of Cyril's theology should be noted here. But to the present writer they seem to misread the theology of Cyril in their enthusiasm to defend the theology of the Antiochene school.

⁶ All the statements of Eutyches referred to here are noted in Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. vi, 696-753, and E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*, II, i, pp. 122-147.

quire into His nature. That He is of the same substance with us, I have not affirmed till now, I confess." Again, "Till this day I have not said concerning the body of the Lord that it is of the same substance with us. But the Virgin is of the same substance with us, I confess." When, however, he was pressed as to how, if the mother was of the same substance with us, the Son could be otherwise, Eutyches said: "As you say now, I agree in every thing." It is clear from these statements that Eutyches was hesitant to affirm that our Lord was of the same substance with us.

Secondly, to the question of whether he would affirm that our Lord was two natures after the union, he answered: "I confess our Lord to be of two natures before the union, but after the union I confess one nature." (διμολογῶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων γεγενῆσθαι τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν πρὸ τῆς ἔνώσεως, μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἔνωσιν μία φύσις διμολογῶ.)

Pushing these two statements to their logical conclusion, it is possible to read into Eutyches a position like this. Before God the Son became incarnate and Godhead and manhood were united in Jesus Christ, He was "of two natures."⁷ When, however, the natures were united, He came to be "one nature." Since as Eutyches was reluctant to affirm that Christ was of the same substance with us, the expression "one nature" may well have meant for him that the manhood was lost, as it were, subsequent to the union.

It is this meaning that the *Tome of Leo*, some Bishops at Chalcedon, and the Chalcedonian Formula of the Faith have seen in Eutyches. The *Tome of Leo*, for instance, has made out that "using deceptive words," Eutyches said that "the Word was made Flesh in such wise as to imply that Christ having been conceived in the Virgin's womb, possessed the form of a man without a real body taken from His mother."⁸ At Chalcedon Basil of Seleucia reported that for Eutyches a mere affirmation that God the Word became man by the assumption of flesh was enough to conserve the faith. (ῶστε εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν τὸν τρόπον τῆς σαρκώσεως καὶ ἔνανθωτήσεως εἰ κατὰ πρόσληψιν σαρκὸς οἴδε τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον γενόμενον ἀνθρωπὸν.) The Chalcedonian Formula, referring in all probability to Eutyches, states that "others introduce a confusion and mixture,

⁷ Unless we ascribe to Eutyches an Origenist Christology, this statement of Eutyches makes no sense. To read that into him is to make of him a thinker of eminence which he certainly was not.

⁸ See T. H. Bindley, *The Ecumenical Documents of the Faith*, Methuen (London, 1950), pp. 224-231. For the Greek passage below see Mansi vi 633 B, and ACO. II, i, p. 92: 164-166.

shamelessly imagining the Nature of the flesh and of the God-head to be one, and absurdly maintaining that the Divine Nature of the Only-begotten is by this confusion possible"; and that the Council "anathematizes those who imagine Two Natures of the Lord before the Union, but fashion anew One Nature after the Union."⁹

But there are other statements of Eutyches in which he shows that this is not his position. So in an oral statement made by him at the Home Synod of Constantinople he said: "Concerning His coming in the flesh, I confess that it happened from the flesh of the Virgin, and that He became man perfectly (*τελείως*) for our salvation." By this statement Eutyches did affirm a real incarnation. He made the same point still clearer in this confession of the faith. "For He Himself," affirmed Eutyches, "who is the Word of God, descended from heaven without flesh, was made flesh of the very flesh of the Virgin unchangeably and inconvertibly in a way which He Himself knew and willed. And He who is always perfect God before the ages, the Same also was made perfect man for us and for our salvation."¹⁰ This statement was certainly not unorthodox, insufficient though we may judge it to conserve the Church's faith fully. So we have to say with J. N. D. Kelly, "The traditional picture of Eutyches, it is clear, has been formed by picking out certain of his statements and pressing them to their logical conclusion. . . . He was not a docetist or Apollinarian, nothing could have been more explicit than his affirmation of the reality and completeness of the manhood . . ."¹¹

In any case, from the point of view of initiating a discussion of the issue which separates the Chalcedonian Church from the non-Chalcedonian Church, the question of whether Eutyches himself had, in fact, held the view ascribed to him by the *Tome of Leo* and the Chalcedonian Formula is not important. What is important, on the other hand, is the question as to whether the non-Chalcedonian Church has ever held the ideas thus ascribed to Eutyches. On this question the answer is quite clear. For Dioscorus of Alexandria did himself express this rejection of the ideas

⁹ T. H. Bindley, *op. cit.*, pp. 232, 235.

¹⁰ For the confession of Eutyches, see G. Hahn, *Bibliothek der symbole und glaubensregeln der alten kirche* (Breslau, 1897), pp. 319-320, and Mansi, *op. cit.*, v 1016 C.

¹¹ J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (Adam and Charles Black, London, 1958), pp. 332-333.

read into Eutyches at Chalcedon.¹² Following him, the non-Chalcedonian Church has, throughout the centuries condemned these ideas¹³ and even the person of Eutyches.

III. THE ERRONEOUS IDEAS ASSIGNED TO THE PHRASE "ONE INCARNATE NATURE OF GOD THE WORD"

Broadly speaking, these ideas may be classified under three heads. We will mention them one by one.

1. A Tendency to Ignore the Manhood of Christ

This, as we have seen, is the position ascribed to Eutyches. Whether he himself held it or not, there were men in olden times who maintained this view. Such men were called "Eutychianists." A certain John the rhetorician of Alexandria is reported to have taught "Eutychianism" during the decade after the Council of Chalcedon.¹⁴

According to Zacharia, John the rhetorician was a student of philosophy, who tried to combine some ideas derived from the Christian faith with his rational speculation. So he maintained that Jesus Christ was God the Word, who came into the world, being born of a virgin without conjugal relation. Being born in this way, He cannot have been fully man. So He was "one nature" in the sense that He was God, but not also man.

2. A Teaching Which Ignores Human Properties in Jesus Christ.

A more subtle position than the foregoing one, this emphasis may be illustrated by referring to Sergius the Grammarian. A correspondent of Severus of Antioch in the sixth century, Sergius expressed it in this way: "Godhead and the flesh are two *ousias*. Eternality is the property of the former and corruptibility that of the latter." In becoming man, God the Son assumed flesh which "was born supernaturally," and the flesh "did not see corruption." But "by reason of the union the human property was passed over."

¹² See Mansi vi 633C, and ACO. II, i, p. 92: 168.

¹³ "Eutychianism" was opposed by the non-Chalcedonian body from the very beginning. Thus we have evidence that Theodosius of Jerusalem, who led the movement against Chalcedon in Palestine soon after the Council, and Timothy Aelurus of Alexandria condemned men who held it.

¹⁴ See Zacharia Rhetor, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, I (Syriac), pp. 163-164.

Therefore, "it is better to say that there was one property" only in Christ.¹⁵

We find here an emphasis, which takes Godhead and manhood as two different *ousias*, each possessing its own property. But they were united in Christ in such a way that the human properties came to be lost in the union. Those who taught this idea took the phrase "one incarnate nature" as a convenient linguistic tool to conserve it.

It may be useful in this context to refer to the misunderstanding of the non-Chalcedonian position expressed by men of the Chalcedonian side in ancient times. John the Grammarian is referred to by Severus of Antioch to have criticized the non-Chalcedonian position as having maintained that "the Godhead and the flesh of Christ constituted one *ousia* and one nature."¹⁶ The argument of the Grammarian may be put in this way: The non-Chalcedonian leaders were insisting that Christ was one incarnate nature, and that He was not two natures after the union. But the very emphasis that Christ was of the same substance with the Father as to Godhead and of the same substance with us as to manhood should be taken as an adequate basis for saying that He was in two natures. The non-Chalcedonian leaders were, however, opposed to the phrase "in two natures." This must be because in their view Christ was one *ousia*. In other words, the opponents of Chalcedon were considered unwilling to affirm the reality of Christ's manhood.

The answer of the non-Chalcedonian leaders to this criticism we shall see in a moment. What we should note in the present context is the fact that their position was very much misunderstood and even misinterpreted by men of the Chalcedonian side in olden times.

3. A Teaching Which Maintains That the Manhood of Christ Was Incorruptible.

This position was held by Julian of Halicarnassus. In fact, it

¹⁵ See *Ad Nephaliūm*, ed. J. Lebon (Louvain, 1949), (Syriac), pp. 71-72.

¹⁶ John the Grammarian was a critic of the non-Chalcedonian position, whose work in defense of Chalcedon was refuted by Severus in his *Liber contra impium grammaticum*. For this criticism of his, see *ibid.* ed. J. Lebon (Louvain, 1952), I (Syriac), p. 20.

had adherents in both the Chalcedonian and the non-Chalcedonian bodies in ancient times. Justinian himself adopted a form of it towards the end of his life, and Justinian was a persecutor of the non-Chalcedonian body.

The teaching of Julian may be summarized in this way.¹⁷ God created man in the beginning essentially immortal and incorruptible. But by the sin of Adam and the consequent fall, he lost this essential property. In order to save man from this fallen state, God the Son became incarnate by uniting to Himself real and perfect manhood. But the manhood which He thus assumed was so sinless that it was the manhood of Adam before the fall, and so it was essentially impassible, immortal and incorruptible. Julian, however, maintained that Christ suffered passions and died on the cross voluntarily for us. At the same time, he insisted that the body of our Lord was from the moment of its formation in the womb of the Virgin incorruptible.

Of the many ideas which Julian emphasized, some are orthodox while others are heretical. Thus the following orthodox ideas in the teaching of Julian may be noted: (a) God the Son became incarnate by uniting to Himself real and perfect manhood. (b) As man, Christ was absolutely sinless. (c) The suffering and death which Christ endured were indispensable for our salvation, and God the Son Himself assumed them as His own.

But the following ideas of Julian seem heretical: (a) When God the Son became incarnate, He united to Himself the manhood of Adam before the fall. So it was essentially impassible and immortal. (b) The body of our Lord was incorruptible, not merely after the resurrection, but from the moment of its conception in the womb of the Virgin. (c) As man, Christ was of the same substance with us, not in the sense that His manhood was our manhood, but only in the sense that it was the essential manhood of Adam before the fall. In other words, according to Julian, the manhood was not only sinless, but it had no involvement in the fallen state of the human race.

¹⁷ This discussion of Julian's teaching is based on a study of the writings of Severus of Antioch against Julian. For the early letters exchanged between them, see Zacharia, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 102-112, and for other writings, see Severi *Antijulianistica*, A. Sanday (Beyrouth, 1931) and British Museum M.S. No. 12158.

IV. THE NON-CHALCEDONIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH IN THE FACE OF THESE ERRONEOUS EMPHASES

These three positions were, in fact, not only rejected but even refuted by the leaders of the non-Chalcedonian Orthodox Church. As we have already noted, John the rhetorician lived during the decade after the Council of Chalcedon. Theodosius of Jerusalem, who led the movement against Chalcedon in Palestine soon after the Council, opposed his teaching and even wrote a treatise refuting it.¹⁸ It is reported that he took strong measures against other "Eutychianists" in Palestine also. Timothy Aelurus, the immediate successor of Dioscorus on the See of Alexandria, was equally opposed to "Eutychianism." During his exile in Gangara Bishop Isiah of Hermopolis and Presbyter Theophilus of Alexandria left Egypt and made their home in Constantinople, where they disseminated "Eutychianist" ideas. On hearing this news, Timothy sent letters opposing them and in the end he excommunicated them.¹⁹ Thus from the point of view of condemning "Eutychianists" and their ideas, there is no ground for doubt that the non-Chalcedonian Church has done it with as much vigour as the Chalcedonian Church. We can, in fact, say that the ancient Orthodox Church of the East which renounced the Council of Chalcedon has, from the beginning, excluded also the heresies which the Council has condemned.

The second and the third erroneous positions noted above came to be expressed during the days of Severus of Antioch. He refuted them, and, under his leadership, his section of the Church also excluded them categorically.

As we have noted, it was Sergius the Grammarian who expressed the second position. Severus answered him by saying that the affirmation of a difference of properties was the teaching of the fathers. The natures which were united in the one Christ, they affirmed, were different. "For one is uncreated, and the other is created." But while "the difference in properties of the natures" continued to be real, "the natures of which the one Christ is, are united without confusion." In this way, "the Word of life is said

¹⁸ See Zacharia, *op. cit.*, pp. 161-164.

¹⁹ For this incident and the letters which Timothy Aelurus wrote in this connection, see Zacharia, *ibid.*, pp. 185-205, and 215-216. That Timothy Aelurus opposed "Eutychianists" is mentioned even by Evagrius. See P.G. LXXXVI 2603 A.

to have become visible and tangible." When we think of the Emmanuel, we shall see that Godhead and manhood are different, and as we confess the union, "the difference signifying the natures of which the one Christ is" we do not ignore, "though by reason of the *hypostatic union*" we discard division.²⁰ In fact, it is on the ground of this admission that Severus works out his emphasis on the *communicatio idiomatum*. For he maintains that there is an exchange of properties in Christ, so that "the Word may be recognized in the properties of the flesh," and the human properties have "come to belong to the Word and the properties of the Word to the flesh."²¹ A passage from the work of Severus against John the Grammarian may be quoted here to show how he maintains a recognition of the principle of difference in the one Christ.²²

"Those, therefore, who confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is one (made up) of Godhead and manhood, and that He is one *prosopon*, one *hypostasis*, and one nature of the Word incarnate, recognize and affirm also the difference, integrity, and otherness of the natures, of which the one Christ is ineffably formed. As they perceive this by subtle thought and contemplation of the mind, they do not take it as a ground for dividing the Emmanuel into two natures after the union."

That in maintaining this point of view Severus was not adopting a position discontinuous with the non-Chalcedonian leaders before him may be shown. As we know, the Formula of Chalcedon contains four adverbs with reference to the union of the natures in Christ, and they are ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως and ἀχωρίστως (without confusion, change, division and separation). The Formula was adopted at Chalcedon on 22nd October 451. But on 8th October, fourteen days before this incident, Dioscorus stated at Chalcedon that in opposing the phrase "two natures after the union" or its cognate "*in* two natures," he was not speaking of confusion, division, change, or mixture (οὐτε σύγχυσιν λέγομεν, οὐτε τομήν. ἀνάθεμα τῷ λέγοντι ἡ σύγχροσιν ἡ τροπὴν ἡ ἀνάκροσιν).²³ Another equally important statement of Dioscorus made at Chalcedon should also be noted here. On one occasion he signified

²⁰ *Ad Nephelium*, *op. cit.*, pp. 74-77.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

²² *Contr. Gr.*, *op. cit.*, III, p. 106.

²³ Mansi VI 676D-677A; *ACO*. II, i, p. 112: 262-263.

that he was in agreement with the affirmation "of two natures after the union."²⁴ These evidences are sufficient to say that in protesting against the Council of Chalcedon, Dioscorus was not showing any sympathy for a theological position which ignored the manhood of our Lord.

All the non-Chalcedonian leaders have affirmed that in His Incarnation God the Son united to Himself manhood animated with a rational soul and of the same substance with us, that He endured in reality blameless passions of the body and the soul, and that there was no confusion or mixture of the natures in Him. Taking these emphases seriously, if we evaluate their teaching, we shall certainly see that in opposing the Council of Chalcedon they were not led by any sympathy for "Eutychianism" or monophysitism of any kind. We shall also realize that they had not interpreted the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word" to mean absorption of the manhood or the human property.

Severus answered also the charge of John the Grammarian that the non-Chalcedonian body was arguing, on the basis of the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word," that in Christ Godhead and manhood formed one *ousia*. In fact, he challenged the critic to show at least a single bit of evidence to prove his charge and made it very clear that his section of the Church did not hold that view.²⁵ This means that for Severus and the Church which he represented "one incarnate nature" did not mean "one *ousia*."

Julian of Halicarnassus was refuted by Severus. Relying on the work of R. Draguet, *Julien d'Halicarnasse et sa controverse avec Sévère d'Antioche sur l'incorruptibilité du corps du Christ* (Louvain, 1924), R. V. Sellers maintains that the difference between the teaching of Severus and that of Julian is largely one of terminology.²⁶ The present writer finds it difficult to agree with this reading of the difference between Severus and Julian.²⁷ Even granting that this reading is correct, would the Chalcedonian side maintain a position more adequate than the one held by Severus?

²⁴ Mansi vi 692A; *ACO*. ii, i, p. 120: 332.

²⁵ For this discussion of Severus, see his *Contr. Gr., op. cit.*, i, pp.20-24.

²⁶ R. V. Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon* (S.P.C.K., 1953), pp. 309-310, note 6.

²⁷ For our reading of the difference between the two men, see above pp. 42-43.

**V. SEVERUS ON "ONE INCARNATE NATURE
OF GOD THE WORD"**

Following Cyril of Alexandria, Severus accepts four phrases with reference to the Incarnation. They are: "of (*ἐν*) two natures," "*hypostatic union*," "one incarnate nature of God the Word," and "one composite nature." In his view all these phrases stand together. So in order to understand what the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word" means to him and to the Church which he represents the meaning of these phrases should be noted.

The crucial word in these phrases is "nature" (*φύσις* or *kyono*). As to its meaning, both Severus and the Chalcedonian writers of his time agree that it may be taken either in the sense of *ousia* or in that of *hypostasis*. Severus shows that *ousia* stands for him both as an equivalent of the *eidos* of Plato and as a generic term including all the members of a class. By *hypostasis* (*ὑπόστασις* or *qnumo*) Severus means a concrete particular in which the *ousia* (*οὐσία* or *ousio* [Syr.]) is individuated. In other words, for both sides "nature" means either the dynamic reality existing in the realm of ideas or the concrete object resulting from its individuation. But they disagree on the application of the word "nature" to the Person of Christ. Whereas the Grammarian takes it in the sense of *ousia*, Severus sees in it the meaning of *hypostasis*.²⁸

Coming now to the phrases themselves, Severus makes it clear that Christ was "of (*ἐν*) two natures." But by this phrase he does not sanction the expression "two natures before the union."²⁹ He says that "no one who has thought correctly has ever affirmed" this phrase "even in fancy."³⁰ For the "*Hypostasis* of God the Word existed . . . before all the ages and times, He being eternally with God the Father and the Holy Spirit"; but "the flesh possessing a rational soul did not exist before the union with him."³¹ The phrase "of (*ἐν*) two natures" means, for Severus, two ideas. On the one hand, it conserves the emphasis that in Christ there was a union of God the Son with an individuated manhood, and on the

²⁸ Severus himself discusses the meaning of the crucial terms both in his *Contra Grammaticum* and in some of his doctrinal letters.

²⁹ He opposes "two natures before the union" in several places in his writings.

³⁰ *Contr. Gram.*, II, p. 239.

³¹ *Patrologia Orientalis*, XII, pp. 190-191.

other that Christ was unceasingly a continuation of that union. So Christ was always "of (*ἐν*) two natures"; and thus He was at once perfect God and perfect man being "of the same substance with God the Father" and "of the same substance with us."

The union of the natures was *hypostatic*, by which Severus means that "it was in union with the Word who is before the ages that the flesh was formed and came *to be*, and in concurrence it [namely the flesh] received with Him concreteness into the union. In this way, from two, namely Godhead and manhood, Christ is known indivisibly one Emmanuel."³²

The phrase "*hypostatic* union," then, means for Severus that in Christ there was a coming together of everything that the Godhead of the Son implies and of everything that an individuated manhood connotes. The phrase means also the absolutely inward and personal character of the union.

In a long passage in his *Philalethes*, Severus discusses the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word." When the fathers spoke of "one incarnate nature of God the Word," he writes, "they made it clear that the Word did not abandon His nature"; neither did He undergo any "loss or diminution in His *hypostasis*. When they affirmed that "He became incarnate" they made it clear that "the flesh was nothing but flesh, and that it did not come into being by itself apart from the union with the Word." Again the words "became incarnate" refer to the Word's assumption of the flesh from the Virgin, an assumption by which from two natures, namely Godhead and manhood, one Christ came forth from Mary." He is at once God and man, being of the same substance with the Father as to Godhead and of the same substance with us as to manhood.³³

There are three emphases made by the phrase "one incarnate nature." (1) It was God the Son Himself who became incarnate. (2) In becoming incarnate, He individuated manhood in union with Himself and made it His very own. (3) The incarnate Word is one Person.

The "one" in the phrase "one incarnate nature" is not a *simple one*, so that the characterization "monophysite" cannot be considered applicable to the position of Severus. As "one incarnate

³² This is a passage taken from *Contr. Gram.*, II, pp. 239-241.

³³ See *Philalethes*, ed. Robert Hespel (Louvain, 1952) (Syriac), p. 139.

nature," Jesus Christ is one *composite* nature. In the Incarnation, by a divine act of condescension, God the Son willed to be so united with manhood that the two of them came together, without either of them being lost or diminished. At the same time, their union was so real and perfect that Christ was "one composite nature."

In the face of the misunderstanding expressed by the Chalcedonian tradition that the non-Chalcedonian position has ignored the manhood of Christ, we shall put together the ideas emphasized by Severus on this point.

(1) Christ's manhood was an individuated manhood, fully like and continuous with our manhood, with the single exception that it was absolutely sinless. (2) The manhood of Christ was individuated only in a *hypostatic* union with God the Son, and it continued to exist in perfection and reality in that union. Therefore, the manhood of Christ did not exist independent of its union with God the Son. (3) The union did not lead to a confusion of the manhood with, or a loss in, the Godhead; and therefore in Christ there were Godhead and manhood with their respective properties *hypostatically* united with each other. But the two should not be separated. (4) The Union brought into being one Person, and this one Person is the Person of God the Son in His incarnate state. There is a distinction between the pre-incarnate Son and the incarnate Son, so that the *Hypostasis* and *Prosopon* of Jesus Christ are not simply the *Hypostasis* and the *Prosopon* of God the Son. (5) The manhood of Christ was real, perfect, and dynamic in the union.

Having made all these emphases, why did Severus and the leaders of the non-Chalcedonian Church refuse to accept the phrase "in two natures?" In fact, both in his letters to Nephalius and in his *Liber Contra Impium Grammaticum*, Severus admits that some earlier fathers had spoken of Christ that He was two natures. These fathers, insists Severus, meant by the expression only that Christ was at once God and man. However, the Nestorian school adopted the phrase to assert a doctrine of two persons. The phrase should not, therefore, be used any longer. Severus says also that

"When we anathematize those who affirm of the Emmanuel two natures after the union and their operations as well as properties, it is not for speaking of natures or operations or properties that we place them under condemnation;

but for saying two natures after the union and assigning the operations and properties to each of them, thereby dividing them between the natures.”⁸⁴

The passage is clear enough. Christ is “of two natures, the properties and operations of each of which are there in Him in a state of indivisible and indissoluble union. To illustrate the point, men saw Christ hunger or thirst or suffer physical and mental agony. It is right on their part to say on the ground of what they saw that Christ’s manhood was the subject of these experiences. So also men saw Him heal the sick and raise the dead. It is correct again to say that the Godhead of Christ did these signs. But in Christ the hunger and all other physical disabilities were human, united with, and made His own by God the Son in His incarnate state. In the same way, the super-human words and deeds were expressions of the Godhead of the Son in union with manhood. In other words, it was the one incarnate Person who was the subject of all the words and deeds of Christ. This one incarnate Person was the “one incarnate nature of God the Word” or the “one composite nature” of the incarnate Son. When we reflect on Him, we can, in our contemplation, distinguish the two natures of Godhead and manhood and their respective properties and operations.

But the *Tome of Leo* went beyond this sound principle, and in declaring it a document of the faith the Council of Chalcedon also committed a great error. According to the *Tome*, “Each nature performs what is proper to it in communion with the other; the Word, for instance, performing what is proper to the Word, and the flesh carrying out what is proper to the flesh.” A teaching of this kind does not affirm Christ’s personal unity, but regards the natures as two persons. The phrase “in two natures” defined by the Council of Chalcedon must have meant the same teaching as that of Bishop Leo. So it cannot be accepted.

VI. THE REAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE CHALCEDONIAN AND THE NON-CHALCEDONIAN POSITIONS

As we have noted, the Chalcedonian East accepts the orthodoxy of the phrase “one incarnate nature of God the Word.” It believes that it is even necessary to maintain this phrase as a safeguard against Nestorianism. But it adds that since the phrase can

⁸⁴ *Ad Nephaliūm*, p. 80.

be taken in a misleading sense, the expression "in two natures" should also be added to it. Thus by "in two natures" Eutychianism can be excluded, and by "one incarnate nature" Nestorianism may be kept out.

The non-Chalcedonian Church, on the other hand, maintains that these two phrases contradict each other in meaning, and that in the light of the theology of the *Tome of Leo* "in two natures" cannot have meant for the Council of Chalcedon anything more than the teaching of Nestorius. As for excluding "Eutychianism," it can be done by insisting on the phrase "of two natures" and by emphasizing that the "one incarnate nature" is "one composite nature." The real terminological difference between the two traditions can thus be seen to lie in the two prepositions of "in" (*ἐν*) and "of" (*ἐν*).

A WORD IN CONCLUSION

It is quite clear that neither Dioscorus of Alexandria nor the non-Chalcedonian Orthodox Church took the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word" in order to ignore, or minimize the importance of, Christ's manhood. But they considered it crucial because it was the phrase by which they affirmed the indivisible unity of the Person of Christ. In fact, while opposing the Council of Chalcedon with reference to its positive affirmation of the faith which they believed was Nestorianism in disguise, they excluded the heresies which the Council had condemned.

Post Script

In the light of the questions raised during the discussion following the reading of this paper, the writer wishes to suggest these changes in the text with a view to bringing out the intended meaning more clearly.

1. Page 43, last three lines may be changed to: "In other words, according to Julian, the manhood of Christ was not only sinless, but was also without a real relation with the fallen human race."

2. Page 49, line 21 may be changed to: "The union resulted in the concurrence of Godhead and manhood into one Person (*hypostasis*) and this one Person . . ."

3. Page 50, lines 8-10 may be changed to: ". . . suffer physical and mental agony, and they may say on the ground of what they saw that it was Christ's manhood which underwent these experiences."

DISCUSSION: Concerning the Paper of Father Samuel

FATHER ROMANIDES: I was very much impressed by the precision and Orthodoxy of this paper. On the basis of this exposition, I cannot see where we differ on essentials. To make myself clear, I would point out that the term *One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate* was accepted by Flavian and Eusebius, although there is strong evidence that they did not understand the exact sense in which Cyril used this phrase. We see this from Flavian's confession of faith of 449 and in the case of both Flavian and Eusebius from the minutes of Ephesus 449 and Chalcedon. The phrase was taken for granted at Chalcedon as equivalent to Cyril's other way of saying the same, *viz.*, *One Hypostasis of God the Logos Incarnate*.

On the basis of Father Samuel's paper, I would like to ask our non-Chalcedonian brothers whether they would accept (1) the phrase *One Physis Composite* as equivalent to *One Ousia Composite*, and (2) *From Two Physeis* as equivalent to *From Two Ousiai*. For Chalcedonians both phrases are unacceptable when *physis* means *ousia* since they would then mean *one ousia in Christ after the union*. When we speak of *In Two Natures* we mean *In Two Ousiai*. Of course, the term is of Latin provenance, but as an anti-Eutychianist statement it should be considered adequate and should not be pressed for philosophical consequences according to this or that school of thought. It is accepted by us only as a statement of faith in the *double consubstantiality* of Christ and nothing more. When *physis* is synonymous with *hypostasis*, as in the theology of St. Cyril, then the terms *From Two Natures*, *One Nature Composite*, and *One Nature After the Union* are not only acceptable, but obviously necessary. Within the context of strict Cyrilian terminology *In Two Natures* would, of course, be impossible. Yet *In Two Ousiai* would be possible.

The teaching of Julian of Halicarnassus that the Logos united to Himself manhood as it was before the fall is not in itself wrong and is accepted by all Fathers. What is wrong with Julian's position, as pointed out by Father Samuel, is that the human nature of Christ was considered incorruptible before the resurrection. I would add that most Fathers would rather say that the human nature of Christ was by nature mortal but not by nature under the power or sentence of death and corruption which are the wages of sin. In this sense even angels are by nature mortal. Only God is by nature immortal. It is for this reason that the death of the Lord of Glory in the flesh was voluntary and not the wages of personal or inherited sin.

Two sentences in the paper seem to me to contradict the position which the paper is trying to defend. They are: (1) p. 50. "It is right on their part to say on the ground of what they saw that Christ's manhood was the subject of these experiences," an echo of Leo's Tome, and p. 49 "the union brought into being one Person," which reminds one of the Nestorian Person brought into being by the union of natures.

FATHER SAMUEL: The first sentence refers only to what men saw in Christ and thought about Him. But in Christ these experiences were ex-

periences of God the Son incarnate. Therefore, no contradiction is implied by it.

The second sentence is based on the emphasis of Severus that there was a distinction between the pre-incarnate Son and the incarnate Son. On the strength of this emphasis Severus shows that the *hypostasis* of Jesus Christ, though it is continuous with the hypostasis of God the Son, is not simply the latter. The *hypostasis* of Jesus Christ is a composite *hypostasis* formed by the concurrence of Godhead and manhood. The second sentence aims only to make this point.

FATHER MEYENDORFF: When we refer to Christ as "One incarnate nature of God the Word" we mean that He is one *hypostasis*. We also accept the phrase "from two natures." But in these phrases the word "nature" means *ousia*.

FATHER ROMANIDES: "From two natures" is used as equivalent to "From two *ousiai*" by Flavian of Constantinople, but never by Cyril and the Alexandrians. The definition of the Fifth Ecumenical Council clearly accepts "From two natures" according to the Cyrillian usage also which speaks of "one nature" in Christ, but not "one *ousia*." Thus we of the Chalcedonian tradition are free to use the term "from two natures" in both the Flavian and Cyrillian sense, but never according to the Eutychian equation of "nature" and "*ousia*."

FATHER FLOROVSKY: The statement on page 49 that the manhood of Christ was absolutely sinless is not enough. We must also say that Christ was free from original sin.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

August 13th, 1964, Morning Session.

THE PROBLEM OF THE UNIFICATION OF THE NON-CHALCEDONIAN CHURCHES OF THE EAST WITH THE ORTHODOX ON THE BASIS OF CYRIL'S FORMULA: "MIA PHYSIS TOU THEOU LOGOU SESARKOMENE"

By PROFESSOR JOHANNES N. KARMIRIS

Anyone will become perplexed who today objectively and unbiasedly investigates the ecclesiastical events of the fifth century A.D. occasioned by Monophysitism. This perplexity is due to the fact that one can find no sufficient dogmatic-ecclesiastical reason for their having detached themselves from the stem of the Orthodox Catholic Church of the East to which they still organically belong. If one also investigates their dogmatic teaching which developed in the following fifteen centuries together with their way of worship, their ecclesiastical structure and their government, one must conclude with astonishment that they agree with the Orthodox Catholic Church in almost all "necessaries," the exception being a vague difference of opinion with regard to the verbal formulation of the dogma of Chalcedon — a difference which is probably more terminological than real. And indeed these churches today appear to us to accept a special form of moderated Monophysitism (as it can incorrectly be named), a Monophysitism which restricts itself only to the acceptance of a divine-human nature, united and joined in Christ. Though they accept this moderated Monophysitism, they at the same time, with the Orthodox Catholic Church, condemn the archheretic, Eutyches, and his pure, unadulterated Monophysitism. This inconsistency can probably be traced to a misunderstanding of the Greek-Orthodox dogmatic terms "ousia," "physis," "prosopon," "hypostasis," "hypostatike enosis," "Logos," etc., which could not be precisely translated into the eastern national languages of the peoples to whom these churches belonged. This is the only major difference between the Orthodox and the above-mentioned venerable eastern churches, a difference which has been blunted significantly with the passing of the centuries so that one can say that it really is restricted to a difference of words and formulations. This difference increased because of the unclarity of their dogmatic doctrine and the interruption of their further dogmatic and theological development.

Similarly, the separation involves several other secondary and unessential differences, e.g. with regard to the number of ecumenical councils, the number of church fathers who are to be venerated and other liturgical and canonical differences and customs.

An opinion similar to that expressed above has remained alive among many Orthodox and many adherents of the other eastern churches from the fifth until the twentieth centuries. This can be seen

- 1) From the participation by certain Armenian bishops in the Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Ecumenical Councils, from the canons of the Trullanum,¹ which are concerned with the Armenians;
- 2) From the condemnation of the "three chapters," pronounced by the Fifth Ecumenical Council, which was received by the non-Chalcedonian churches; from the encyclical addressed to "all bishop's sees in the East" (866)² by the Patriarch of Constantinople, Photius;
- 3) From the negotiations between Byzantine and Armenian representatives in the twelfth century which were in favour of union, and particularly from the famous "discussion" of the Byzantine Theorianos with the Armenian Catholicos, Nerses IV;³
- 4) From the declaration published by the local Orthodox Synod of Jerusalem (1672)⁴ in favour of the non-Chalcedonian churches;
- 5) And from the declaration of the Ecumenical Patriarch in 1951;⁵
- 6) From the amicable attitude during the meeting between Orthodox and non-Chalcedonian representatives at the First Pan-Orthodox Meeting at Rhodes in 1961.

The classical dogmatician of the Orthodox Church, John of Damascus, successfully expressed Orthodoxy's positive attitude towards the non-Chalcedonian Christians of the East when he said that he considered them, "on the basis of the Constitution of Chalcedon, to be separated from the [Orthodox] Church only with

¹ Joh. Karmiris, *The Dogmatic and Symbolic Monuments of the Orthodox Catholic Church* (Athens, 1960), vol. I (2), pp. 231, 233, 234.

² *Ibid.*, p. 322.

³ Migne, P.G., 133, 119-297. See also, B. Stefanides, *Church History* (Athens, 1948), p. 380.

⁴ Joh. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, vol II (1), 1953, p. 731.

⁵ *Ibid.*, vol I (2), p. 172. "Orthodoxia" (Constantinople) 26 (1951), 483, 490.

regard to their geographical position, while being Orthodox in all other things."⁶ Because of this situation, it is necessary that on both sides intensive efforts be made towards the reunion of the non-Chalcedonian churches with the Orthodox Church.

Self-evidently, all discussions and endeavours towards union must concentrate on the one serious dogmatic difference of opinion existing between them in order to eliminate it. This difference of opinion concerns the dogma of the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ, as formulated at the Fourth Ecumenical Council. As soon as this difference is settled, the other smaller ones existing between them can easily be eliminated. With regard to this cardinal difference we believe that, provided that the dogma of Chalcedon remains untouched, a new *formula concordiae* could be found for the Orthodox Church and for the non-Chalcedonian churches separated from it which would satisfy both sides; because in regard to the essence of the dogma there does not seem to be any real difference. The entire difference of opinion of the non-Chalcedonian eastern churches is based in their traditional, monophysitizing formulation of the dogma of the union of the two natures in Christ, although these churches understand this dogma in an almost Orthodox manner, believing that the two natures, the divine and the human, "neither mixed nor changed," are united in Christ. The difference of opinion which arose at the time of the Fourth Ecumenical Council and which was confirmed thereafter, seems afterwards to have increasingly lost its incisiveness and has almost completely disappeared today. Admittedly, the separated eastern churches hesitate to acknowledge the Fourth Ecumenical Council and clearly to confess the two natures in Christ. On the other hand, they accept the two natures in all essentials, as "neither mixed nor changed nor divided," rejecting only the Chalcedonian "en duo physisi" (in two natures) after the union and holding to the "ek duo physeon" (from two natures) before the union. Therefore, we believe that the phrase of St. Cyril of Alexandria which is more used by and satisfactory to the monophysitizing churches, could be proposed as the basis for the desirable union. This phrase reads: "Mia physis tou Theou Logou sesarkomene" or the more Orthodox "sesarkomenou" (one incarnate nature of the God-Logos). In using it, it would be understood and interpreted in an Orthodox way, being generally

⁶ *De haeres.*, 83. Migne, P.G., 94, 741.

understood in terms of Cyril's doctrine of the union of the two natures in Christ.

However, how do St. Cyril and the later Orthodox fathers understand the phrase "mia physis tou Theou Logou sesarkomenē"? Clearly they interpret the term "one nature" as *one* hypostasis, as *one* person of the God-Logos, who became incarnate. In other words, they view this phrase as being equivalent in meaning to the statement of John the Evangelist "the Word became flesh" (John 1:14). And, in fact, when they concerned themselves with Nestorius' false teaching of "two natures = two persons," they believed that they could answer him by emphasizing the "one nature," that is, by emphasizing the one hypostasis, the one person of the God-Logos, which was used as the basis for the hypostatic union of the divine and the human natures. As is well known, the terms "nature," "hypostasis" and "person" were equated at that time since they were regarded as synonymous and identical. For that reason, the term "nature," in the phrase in question, is to be understood as "person" in and of itself, i.e. the person of the eternal God-Logos. St. Cyril writes: ". . . the nature of the Logos, i.e. the hypostasis, which is the Logos itself."⁷ By means of the preceding word "one" every Nestorian sense of a division of the one person of the incarnate Logos of God is excluded and his unity is stressed. Moreover, the participle translated by the English word "incarnate" declares that the human nature, when the fullness of time was come, was received by and hypostatically united to the eternal Logos of God. Thus, this participle occurs also in Cyril's writings both in the nominative, to agree with the word "nature," as in the phrase quoted above, and in the genitive, to agree with the phrase "of the Son and Logos," as in the following: "mia physis Huiou sesarkomenou" (one nature of the incarnate Son), and "mian einai pisteuomen ten tou Huiou physin, hos henos plen enanthropesantos kai sesarkomenou"⁸ (we believe in the one nature of the Son, but as having become man and flesh). According to this, the expression "one nature" means one hypostasis, one person, but not, as Nestorius believed, two natures, i.e. two hypostases, or two persons, after the union. This is true because the "one nature," i.e. the one hypostasis of the God-Logos, "became incarnate." It is thus united without mixture with the

⁷ Cyril of Alexandria, *Apology*, Migne, P.G., 76, 401.

⁸ Cyril of Alexandria, *Epist.*, 40, Migne, P.G., 77, 192/3.

human nature, received fully and completely from the Virgin Mary — a human nature which never existed before and outside of the hypostatic union ("ou gar prohypostase kath' heauten sarki henothe ho Theos Logos" — because the God-Logos did not unite with a human nature, pre-existing of itself),⁹ being without hypostasis (anhypostatos) and without person (aprosopos) "in contemplation" (en ennoiais); because as person it used the person, or hypostasis, of the God-Logos.¹⁰ For this reason, the term "nature," both in Cyril's expression "one nature" and in Nestorius' term "two natures," has the meaning of hypostasis (or person) of the one who exists in and of himself, as said already. According to St. John of Damascus, St. Cyril understands by the "expression 'incarnate' the essence of the flesh; with the term 'one nature' he understands the one hypostasis of the Logos . . . i.e. his divinity. . . . Thus, they are two natures" (tou eipein sesarkomenene, ten tes sarkos ousian . . . dia de tou mian phisin, ten mian hypostasin tou Logou . . . t.e. tes theotetos autou . . . hoste duo eisi physeis).¹¹ Cyril emphatically places the "one nature" = the one person of the incarnate God-Logos, in opposition to Nestorius' "two natures" = two persons. But he understands the one person to be the bearer of both natures, these being "neither mixed nor changed," but joined in such a way that no confusion, mixture or change, no assimilation or transition of the one into the other nature occurs: "ouch hos tes ton physeon diaphoras aneremenes dia ten henosin."¹² In this way Cyril avoided not only Monophysitism but also Apollinarianism in combatting Nestorianism.

That St. Cyril of Alexandria really uses the term "nature" in the sense of "hypostasis" or "person," i.e. with the meaning of the God-Logos himself together with the flesh united to him, is indicated often in his writings. Thus, in order to combat the Nestorians who imagine or confess "that the hypostases are separate after the indivisible union" and thus hold that there are "two Sons," he taught that the Lord, "being God by nature, became incarnate and therefore became a man, animated by a rational soul . . . on this account, all of the terms which are to be heard

⁹ John of Damascus, *Expositio orth. fidei*, III, 2. Migne, P.G., 94, 985.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, III, 11, P.G. 94, 1024/5.

¹¹ John of Damascus, *op. cit.*, III, 7, 8. *De comp. nat.* 3. Migne, P.G., 94, 1012/3. 95, 116/7.

¹² Cyril of Alexandria, *Epist. 4, ad Nestor.* Migne, P.G., 77, 45.

in the Gospels are to be attributed to one person, to one incarnate hypostasis of the Logos" or "to one hypostasis of the incarnate Logos because the one Jesus Christ is Lord according to the Scriptures."¹³ Being used interchangeably, the terms "nature," "hypostasis" and "person" become synonymous. "One nature, therefore, one hypostasis of the incarnate God-Logos, i.e. one person, one Lord." Consequently, as Emperor Justinian confirmed, "the term 'nature' was used in place of hypostasis."¹⁴ Thus, with regard to its contents, the phrase "one incarnate nature of the God-Logos" is Orthodox; it is only its external expression and formulation which seem to remind one slightly of Monophysitism. Thus, as already stated, the term "nature of the God-Logos" testifies to the divine nature and the term "incarnate" testifies to the human nature which is not of itself an hypostasis, but has become "enhypostatos," so to speak, in the hypostasis of the Logos. Furthermore the term "one nature" testifies to the one hypostasis (or one person) of the God-Logos, i.e. to the one God-Logos, who has become flesh according to St. John's formulation (John 1:14). The unity of the person, i.e. of the bearer of both natures, is preserved in that the entire phrase is equated with the following ones: "one God-Logos incarnate" or "only one is Christ, the Logos from the Father, with his own flesh."¹⁵ Thus, St. Cyril assumes two complete natures from whose hypostatic union the one Christ resulted. He therefore does not hold that there is one nature in the monophysitic sense, i.e. that there is one substance of divinity and humanity — a view which was condemned by the Fifth Ecumenical Council.¹⁶ As a result, we have here, with respect to contents, the dogma of Chalcedon about the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ. However, it is expressed in the style of the theological school of Alexandria which emphasizes the one person of Christ, thus stressing the one Christ in antithesis to the Antiochian school which emphasized the persons — and thus two Christs — in the union and after it. Thus, Cyril of Alexandria himself, the Fifth Ecumenical Council, the Confession of the Emperor Justinian,

¹³ Cyril of Alexandria, *Apologeticus*, Migne, P.G., 76, 340; *In Job. fragm.* P.G., 74, 24.

¹⁴ Emperor Justinian, *Confessio fidei*, in *Maus, Sacrorum Conciliorum . . . Collectio*, 9, 545.

¹⁵ Cyril of Alexandria, *Epist. 17*, Migne, P.G., 77, 112. Joh. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, I (2), p. 142.

¹⁶ Joh. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, I (2), p. 195.

Leontius of Byzantium, John of Damascus and other Orthodox fathers understood the phrase "one incarnate nature of the God-Logos" in this Orthodox sense.

However, how does Cyril understand the union of the two natures (as indicated in the above-mentioned phrase) in a narrower and in a more general sense? This he explains elsewhere: "We said that the two natures united. However, we believe that after they united the nature of the Son is one, as though the division were already eliminated. And yet, this nature of the Son is that of one who has become incarnate and human. If one should say, however, that the Logos, being God, became incarnate and human, then any expectation of a change should be rejected (because he remained precisely what he was), and among us the entire, complete and unmixed union should be confessed also."¹⁷ In this way, any type of monophysitic misunderstanding of the union is excluded. And again he wrote elsewhere that "(the Logos) being by nature God, was begotten as man, not simply in terms of connection (*synapheia*), as he (Nestorius) says, whereby he has an external unity in mind (and therefore a relative one), but as a union which is true although one cannot verbally grasp it and which surpasses understanding. Thus he is to be understood as the one and only one; because the nature is to be understood as a single whole after the union, i.e. as the incarnate nature of the Logos himself. That is something which we can similarly conceive of with regard to ourselves; for a human being is truly one, although he is composed of dissimilar things, i.e. of soul and body."¹⁸ Thus, by the term "*mia physis*" here too he wishes to emphasize the unity of the person of the God-Logos by the phrase "one incarnate nature of the God-Logos." The unity of the person of Christ is after all the result of the hypostatic union of the two natures (without their having been mixed, merged or changed) just as the one true human being results from the union of soul and body — completely "disparate things." As our famous father and bishop, Athanasius, whose belief is a constant rule for Orthodoxy, also said in his writings: "two things, by nature unlike, have come together: i.e. divinity and humanity; the one resulting from both of these is Christ."¹⁹

¹⁷ Cyril of Alexandria, *Epist. 40*, Migne, P.G., 77, 192/3.

¹⁸ Cyril of Alexandria, *Adversus blasphem. Nestorii*, Migne, P.G., 76, 60/1. E. Schwartz, *Acta Concil. I.I*, 6, p. 33.

¹⁹ Cyril of Alexandria, *Homil. 8*, 6. Migne, P.G., 77, 572.

Furthermore, Cyril taught, that in uniting the two natures in Christ, the Orthodox "confess one Christ, one Son, the same one Lord and, accordingly, one incarnate nature of God." However, "no mixture, or synkrasis respectively, of the two natures occurred." ". . . the one nature is distinct from the other, out of both of which the one and only Christ is to be understood. Neither did they fail to recognize that where union is spoken about, it does not mean the coming together of one thing, but of two or more things which are by nature different. When we say 'union,' we thus confess the union of the flesh, which has a soul, and the Logos. And those who say 'the two natures' mean the same thing. Indeed, after the union, that which has been united cannot be divided. On the contrary, the Son is one, his nature one, as that of the incarnate Logos . . ." or, "according to the voice of John, the Logos became flesh."²⁰ Apparently, the phrase "his one nature" (*mia physis autou*) is to be thought of in connection with the preceding term "one Son" (*eis Huios*), as the one hypostasis of the Son, so that the unity of the person of the incarnate God-Logos was not annulled by assuming flesh — as also after the union "that which has been united can no longer be separated." Elsewhere, in countering a slanderous accusation against himself according to which he allegedly accepted, with the above-cited statements, a "mixing, i.e. alteration, or merging of the Logos with the body, i.e. a transformation of the body into the nature of divinity," he wrote that "the two natures, unmixed, unchanged and not transformed, have joined one another in indivisible union; because the flesh is flesh and not divinity even though it has become God's flesh. In the same way, the Logos is God and not flesh, even though he, according to his plan of salvation, made the flesh his own. . . . After the union we do not separate the natures from one another; nor do we divide the one indivisible Son into two Sons. But we confess that there is one Son and he is the one incarnate nature of the God-Logos, as the fathers said."²¹ With the last sentence and with this teaching, Cyril combatted the Nestorian division of the one into two Sons, and expressed the Orthodox faith in the one incarnate Son, i.e. in the Son who became flesh. He confessed: "The Logos from God the Father hypostatically

²⁰ Cyril of Alexandria, *Epist. 44, to Eulogius the Presbyter*. Migne, P.G., 77, 225.

²¹ Cyril of Alexandria, *op. cit., 45, to Sucensus the Bishop I.* Migne, P.G., 77, 232.

united himself with the flesh and thus there is one Christ with his own flesh, i.e. he is God and man at the same time" (*sarki kath' hypostasin henosthai ton ek Theou Patros Logon, hena te einai Christon meta tes idias sarkos, ton auton delonoti Theon te homou kai anthropon*),²² the bearer of both of the natures hypostatically united in him. Similarly, he condemned every idea of fusion in the union of the two natures, as also every idea of confusion, emptying (of the one into the other), reciprocal mingling, mixture, blending, mingling, change, alteration, transformation, conversion, or metastasis respectively, of those two natures.

Cyril elsewhere explained the Orthodox sense of the phrase "one incarnate nature of the God-Logos" as meaning the one God-Logos, who also assumed human nature and united himself with it. He wrote: "Again, those who distort what is correct have failed to recognize that it is in truth one incarnate nature of the Logos. Now if there is one Son who is by nature truly the Logos from God the Father who was born in a way which is inexpressible and who then, after assuming flesh (not flesh without a soul, but flesh with soul) spiritually issued from a woman as a man, then he is not to be divided into two persons or Sons, but remained one, not without flesh, nor external to a body, but having, by virtue of an indivisible union, his own (body). Anyone who says this asserts neither fusion nor a confusion nor anything else of this sort. Furthermore, such cannot be deduced from the term. If one would say to us that the only begotten Son of God became incarnate and man, that does not imply that the two natures were confused. Neither was the nature of the Logos transformed into that of the flesh, nor was that of the flesh transformed into that of the Logos. Each nature is to be thought of as remaining itself — thus according to the manner of expression offered by us. Inexpressible and impossible to grasp in words is the way in which he united himself and manifested to us the one nature of the Son, which nature, now, as I said, is the incarnate one. This is the case because the oneness is not attributed merely to that which belongs to the nature, but also to that which is joined in the synthesis which is man, consisting of body and soul. These are disparate things, differing in nature, which truly unite there and result in the one nature of the man. . . . There is, therefore, no reason to say

²² Cyril of Alexandria, *op. cit.*, 17, to *Nestorius*. Migne, P.G., 77, 120. Joh. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, I (2), p. 145.

that, if the one nature of the Logos had really become incarnate, then clearly a fusion and confusion would have had to take place, the human nature decreasing and disappearing. The human nature, however, was neither reduced, as they maintain, nor did it disappear. It completely suffices to assert that he became man, i.e. that he became incarnate. If we omitted this, then they would be in some way justified in their slander. Since, however, the phrase 'was incarnate' is necessarily added, where does a reduction or a sort of disappearance occur?"²³

Herewith, Cyril declares that he does not understand the phrase "one incarnate nature of the God-Logos" in a monophysitic sense, but in an Orthodox sense. He does so in asserting that he acknowledges the human nature, complete and intact, and thus without fusion or confusion, without reduction or decrease, as well as the divine one after their union in Christ. And elsewhere he adds: "When we spoke of the one nature of the Logos, we held back and did not add the term 'incarnate' to it, but left it to the divine economy. The word 'Logos' at the same time served as a not improbable foundation to those who formulate the question of what is perfect in humanity or, how our own inherent nature exists. However, since perfection in humanity and the expression of our individual existence is brought in by the mention of the term 'incarnate,' they should cease clutching at a straw. One should condemn those who reject the divine plan and deny the incarnation by withholding from the Son perfect humanity. When one says that he became incarnate, one is confessing the fact that he became man, clearly and indubitably. As a result, this does not hinder one from thinking that 'one Son only, Christ, exists and he is God and man, perfect in divinity as in humanity . . .' "²⁴ According to that, therefore, they "clutch at a straw" who still today wish to understand Cyril's phrase "one incarnate nature of the God-Logos" in a monophysitic way. Because this phrase includes both natures which are hypostatically united in Christ, and it teaches quite clearly that "only one Son, Christ, exists and he is God and man, as complete in divinity as in humanity." Cyril stressed this fact repeatedly when he taught that the eternal Logos of God, incarnate in time, had received the entire and complete

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 241.

²⁴ Cyril of Alexandria, *op. cit.*, p. 244. See also, Leontius of Byzantium, *Scholien VIII*, Migne, *P.G.*, 86/1, 1253.

human nature, consisting of body and soul, from the Virgin Mary. And thus, after rejecting Monophysitism he also rejected Apollinarianism which denied to Christ's human nature its reasoning soul, or spirit (*nous*), and for this reason employed the contested formulation "mía physis tou Theou Logou sesarkomene." In antithesis thereto, Cyril speaks of a union of two complete and real natures, "of things, i.e. of hypostases, which are joined" (*pragmaton egoun hypostaseon gegone synodos*),²⁵ so that the Lord was composed "out of two different kinds of things" (*ek duoin pragmatoin*),²⁶ both of which retained the natural dissimilarity and disparity which they possessed before their union in him. On that account he characterized the union of the two natures only too accurately as "indescribable," "inexpressible," "inconceivable," "completely inexpressible and surpassing understanding," "extraordinary," "paradoxical," and as "a magnificent mystery which surpasses understanding" and can only be glimpsed and worshipped in faith.

It follows from all which has been said, that Cyril of Alexandria understood the one person of the incarnate God-Logos who had also assumed human nature and had united it to his divine nature, by the phrase "the one incarnate nature of the God-Logos." For that reason he states that the incarnate Logos is worthy of worship. He even employs the phrase "one incarnate nature of the God-Logos" in order thereby to teach the one way of worship in which the incarnate Logos is to be worshipped, substituting the phrase "one nature of the God-Logos which is incarnate and is worshipped" (*mian physin tou Theou Logou sesarkomenen kai proskynoumenen*) for the phrase "*Huiion proskynoumenon*" (the Son who is worshipped). Thus he writes: we confess "not two natures of the one Son, one which is to be worshipped and one which is not to be worshipped, but one nature of the God-Logos which is incarnate and worshipped with his flesh in one act of worship. Neither do we confess two Sons, one of which is other than the true Son of God who is worshipped . . ."²⁷ Elsewhere he states that "we worship the Logos of God with his own flesh as

²⁵ Cyril of Alexandria, *To Those Who Dare to Advocate Nestorius' Doctrines*, Migne, P.G., 76, 396.

²⁶ Cyril of Alexandria, *Address to Theodosius XLIV*, Migne, P.G., 76, 1200.

²⁷ Cyril of Alexandria, *Apolog. and Prosphor.*, Migne, P.G., 76, 349. 1209. 1212.

one”²⁸ and that “we are accustomed to honouring the Emmanuel by means of an act of worship, not detaching, hypostatically, the body of the Logos which is united to him”²⁹ so that “we worship one God who is at the same time man, believing in him as in the one who consists of divinity and humanity.”³⁰ Here it should be noted that insofar as the worship cannot be related to the nature in itself, but only to the one bearer of both natures, it follows that Cyril means the one hypostasis — and thus the one person of the incarnate God-Logos in the Orthodox and not in the monophysitic sense — by the phrase “the one incarnate nature of the God-Logos.” That is, he means thereby the one God-Logos who became man and incarnate and who, together with his flesh, is worshipped in one act of worship, or as it was stated at the Fifth Ecumenical Council: “ton Theon Logon sarkothenta meta tes idias autou sarkos.”³¹

From the passages quoted above, as well as from many more, one can conclude that Cyril teaches the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ, i.e. the essential true and real union as opposed to the Nestorian “synapheia” (connection), i.e. an external, ethical and relative coexistence between the two natures. Yet, he conceives of the union as being without confusion, change or transformation and as being unchangeable, since the Logos of God “became incarnate neither by a metastasis or change, nor by a transformation into the nature of the flesh, nor by a confusion or fusion nor, as supposed by some, by a connection between two natures. Why those who suppose the latter do so is unexplained because the nature of the flesh is by nature unchangeable (*atreptos*) and not transformable (*analloiotos*).”³² Cyril repeats in many passages of his writings that the divine and human nature remained unchanged in Christ, united “asygchytos kai *atreptos*.” The last-mentioned adjectives were taken over by the Synod of Chalcedon. And for that reason he also agrees with the *expositio fidei* of the “Diallagai” with the Antiocheans of 433. He agreed with them in the essence of the Christological doctrine, always confess-

²⁸ Cyril of Alexandria, *Adv. Nestor.* 3, 1. Migne, *P.G.*, 76, 121.

²⁹ Cyril of Alexandria, *ibid.*, p. 97.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 60.

³¹ Joh. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, I (2), p. 195.

³² Cyril of Alexandria, *Epist. 55, concerning the sacred symbol.* Migne, *P.G.*, 77, 304.

ing one Christ, perfect God and perfect man, of one substance with the Father in nature because of his divinity and of one substance with us in nature because of his humanity; because the predicates occurring in the Gospels are distinguished as divine ones and human ones, some referring to the one person of Christ, others dividing themselves between the two natures.⁸⁸ And this doctrine was accepted by the Fourth Ecumenical Council as well as by the Catholic Church in the East and in the West.

With everything which we have set forth here, we have attempted to ascertain and to interpret the deeper meaning of the famous formulation of St. Cyril of Alexandria, namely "mia physis tou Theou Logou sesarkomene." This formulation is the one to which the adherents of the non-Chalcedonian churches of the East appeal also today, in that they view it as expressing, more or less, their faith in the dogma of the union of the two natures in Christ. If our above interpretation should be regarded as correct by them, especially since it is attested to by Cyril himself and by other later authentic sources, and if the above-mentioned Christian brothers really do accept and honour the entire Christological doctrine of St. Cyril as did the Fourth Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon and the whole Church of Christ in East and West, then the agreement and finally also the reunion with the Orthodox could be based precisely upon the above-cited formulation as above interpreted, and, in general, upon the Christological doctrine of St. Cyril of Alexandria — to be sure, interpreted in the Orthodox sense. As is well known, the church, since the First Ecumenical Council, has not hesitated to employ new terms, phrases and formulations in restating former expressions and expositions of dogmatic truths. The difficult discussions about the "homoousion" which the holy fathers carried on at that great Council might serve as an eloquent example of this. Therefore, the church is not obliged to remain inflexible and to wrangle over words and phrases; it has the right to change them or to replace them with others. The only qualification is that the essence of the Orthodox dogmas, which in any case must always remain unchanged, may not be affected or altered. And so in the case in question, the Church is entitled to use a new formulation which satisfies and unites divided Christians. For that reason we believe that if the eastern Christians really accept the Christology of St. Cyril, a Christology

⁸⁸ Joh. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, I (2), pp. 154 f.

accepted by the Orthodox as well, then the agreement desired by both sides can come about on the basis of his teaching. Also, with God's help, reunification could be achieved by drawing up a Christological formula of union and a text similar to that of the "Dialagai" of 433 and corresponding to Cyril's Orthodox doctrine. This, to be sure, must be done in such a way as not to invalidate the dogma of Chalcedon.

May, therefore, the eastern brethren re-examine the subject touched upon here in the spirit of Christian brotherliness and love, and may they then revise their attitude to the Fourth Ecumenical Council and the Orthodox Catholic Church, especially since they claim that they reject the extreme Monophysitism of Eutyches, whom they personally condemn as did the great Council of Chalcedon, a Council which they falsely consider to be Nestorian in tendency. Thereafter it will be easy to settle the other secondary and unessential differences which exist between the divided churches in the spirit of love and of desire for understanding. Included among these secondary differences are the following: those with regard to the form of worship, those in connection with the canon, those regarding the number of ecumenical councils, and that resulting from the veneration rendered to Dioskoros, Patriarch of Alexandria, by some members of the eastern churches. In this connection, it is granted that he was not damned for heresy by the Fourth Ecumenical Council but was only deposed because of anti-canonical activities. As Anatolios, the Patriarch of Constantinople, stated in the fifth session of that Council: "Dioskoros was not deposed because of the faith, but because he excommunicated His Lordship Leo, the Archbishop, and, though summoned before the Council three times, did not appear (dia ten pistin ou katherethe ho Dioskoros, all' epeide akoinonesian epoiese to kyrio Leonti to archiepiskopo kai triton eklethe kai ouk elthen)" before the council.³⁴ What is more, the same Dioskoros expressly rejected the false teachings of Eutyches.³⁵

³⁴ Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum . . . collectio*, tom. 7, 104; Metropolitan of Nevrokopiou Georgios, *The Union of the Coptic with the Orthodox Church Is Easy* (Greek), (Saloniki, 1952), pp. 53/9.

³⁵ Mansi, *op. cit.*, tom. 6, 633. Schwartz, *op. cit.*, tom. II, 1, 92. 168.

DISCUSSION: Concerning the Paper of Professor Karmiris

FATHER SAMUEL: In the main your position is fully acceptable to Severus. There might be one or two points of detail that I would refer to later. If this is the position of the Eastern Chalcedonians, then we are in complete agreement.

ABBA HABTEMARIAM: I agree with these sentiments of Fr. Samuel. Yet there seems to be some difficulty about the nature of the union." I would like to know what is really the difficulty for you in speaking about *mīa physis* after the union of two natures.

PROFESSOR KARMIRIS: We can speak of *one physis* after the union, but with the meaning of one *hypostasis*, with the four Chalcedonian qualifying adverbs: *asygchytos, atreptos, adiairetos, achoristos*.

ARCHBISHOP SEVERIUS: From our discussion so far I come to feel that there are no insoluble problems of doctrine between us concerning the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. We affirm that our Lord Jesus Christ is perfect God and perfect man, and that He is one Person and one nature. You also maintain the same faith by affirming that He is "in two natures." Whereas we emphasize the union of the natures, you insist on their distinctness.

We were afraid that the faith formulated by the Council of Chalcedon tended towards Nestorianism, and you were led by the misunderstanding that we were holding the heresy of Eutyches. However, the fact is that we are not Eutychians; neither are you Nestorians. Therefore, the way is clear before us for mutual understanding. This means that we have been, and still are, fighting about words and phrases.

We have all along been led by the feeling that there was enough ground at the Council of Chalcedon to justify our understanding that it favoured Nestorianism. But we see now that you understand the Council in a very different way, and that you exclude Nestorianism completely.

The fact that our difference is merely terminological was stated by one of our Church fathers, Gregory Bar Hebraeus of the thirteenth century, who was a man admirably conversant with the Greek language. "I am convinced," he said, "that the dispute of Christians among themselves is not based on essentials, but on words and terms. For all Christians confess that Christ our Lord is perfect God and perfect man without mixture and confusion of the natures. While one refers to the union (of the natures) as 'nature,' another calls it 'person' and a third 'prosopon.' Thus I see that all Christian people, though they remain separate, are, in fact, in agreement."

I am indeed most happy that this statement of Bar Hebraeus has been shown to be true to facts by our Consultation here.

PROFESSOR KARMIRIS: I have read the texts on both sides of the dispute. (a) I have come to the conclusion that there is no real difference between the Orthodox and the non-Chalcedonians as far as the essence of the Christological dogma is concerned, as all of them accept the teaching of St. Cyril of Alexandria. There is a difference only regarding the terminology and formulation of this dogma. In the same way there are sec-

ondary differences regarding worship, canon law, customs and uses, etc. But none of these things should divide the Churches; Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, wrote: "Where matters of faith are not denied and there is no case of falling away from the common and catholic teaching accepted by all, when some maintain different customs and uses, one should not condemn those who profess or accept them. . . ."

(b) The Fourth Ecumenical Council must be understood and interpreted in the light of the teaching of the Third Ecumenical Council, as well as of the Fifth which is more directly related to it, because between these three Councils there is an agreement, continuity and unity completed by the Sixth Ecumenical Council. The Fourth Ecumenical Council should be understood also in the light of the teaching of St. Cyril of Alexandria, on which it is principally based.

(c) The theologians who participated in this Consultation should suggest to their Churches the appointment of a mixed commission of Orthodox and non-Chalcedonian theologians to determine and study deeply all the points of agreement and disagreement on the Christological dogma, as well as on subjects regarding worship, church administration, etc. This Commission should draft a *formulam concordiae* on the Christological dogma on the basis of the teaching of St. Cyril of Alexandria and of the other ancient Church Fathers and submit it in due time to their churches. The appointment of this Commission must be discussed and decided by the Third Pan-Orthodox Consultation which is to take place in Rhodes during this coming November, and by the Consultation which is to take place in Addis Ababa in the near future. The decisions and the actions to be taken afterwards depend entirely upon the Synods of the churches concerned, which should promote further and in a canonical way the sacred cause of the reunion of their churches.

ARCHBISHOP TIRAN: I was glad to listen to Professor Karmiris. But I would request our Greek brethren to stop saying that the non-Chalcedonian Fathers of the Church did not understand the terms used during the Christological controversy. The misunderstandings were due to the imprecise use of the Greek terms by the Greeks themselves, and not to the inadequacy of the other languages. The Catholicos-Patriarch Nersess IV of Armenia, who negotiated for union with the Emperor and Patriarch of Constantinople during the seventies of the 12th century, states that the difference between the positions of the two sides is terminological and Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians are trying to express the same truth and the same orthodoxy. The realization of this fact did not help much to produce agreement, because there were many non-theological and sometimes non-essential elements which occupied the minds of people on both sides. However, we must thank God, the ground has now been cleared of these non-essential impediments and our task has thus been made easier.

PROFESSOR KARMIRIS: I agree with you. The problem of language is not a real one.

PROFESSOR MEYENDORFF: Our consultation seems to have reached a point where a common agreement seems to arise. This will probably become more obvious as the other papers are read.

If our difference is mainly terminological, then why were we separated for so many centuries? There may be something in the historical and cultural context which we need to clarify by investigation.

Our ecclesiologies are also identical. We do not insist on a single jurisdictional authority for the unity of the Church. The political unity of the Empire, a Roman idea, was however a dominant force in the early Byzantine history. It does not exist any more today, and no one should therefore be afraid of losing his independence.

We will have to find some kind of agreement in faith, but also a common approach to the historical background.

PROFESSOR ROMANIDES: The dogmatic continuity of both the Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian traditions through the Councils of Ephesus, 449, and Chalcedon, 451, can be seen in the fact that Dioscoros was considered quite Orthodox in his faith by such leading Fathers of the Council of Chalcedon as those represented by Anatolius of Constantinople. It is also significant that the Egyptian bishops asked to be temporarily exempt from signing the definition of Chalcedon on the grounds that they now, after the deposition of Dioscoros, had no Archbishop, and so could not act on the basis of the traditions of Egypt. They were criticized by some for placing a local synod above an imperial ecumenical synod. This discussion concerning the relationship between local and ecumenical synods demonstrates clearly that the ecumenical synods convened by the Roman Emperors were imperial in nature and had the character of a pan-imperial ecclesiastical senate gathered in order to inform the government about the faith and practice of the Church for purposes of incorporating Church teaching and practice into the legal and social structures of the Roman Ecumene. The Nature of these imperial synods was demonstrated very vividly by the fact that at the tenth session of Chalcedon, when the bishops had reached a point wherein the Ephesine Synod of 449 was becoming aggravatingly problematical in dealing with the case of Ibas of Edessa, the bishops moved that a request be made to the emperor that the 449 Synod be erased from the lists of Ecumenical Synods. This clearly proves that the decisions of 449 were considered politically and ecclesiastically binding. Until this point in the deliberations at Chalcedon some of the acts of Ephesus 449 were reversed by dealing with them one by one, and other acts were simply accepted, as for example the decisions concerning Theodore and Ibas who at Chalcedon were restored only when they anathematized Nestorius and accepted Cyril's *Twelve Chapters*. Therefore, not much attention was given to Leo of Rome's ravings over the heretical nature of this Dioscorian Synod. Besides indicating the ecclesiastico-political nature of the Ecumenical Synods, the aforementioned facts prove that the Council of Ephesus of 449 was not rejected for doctrinal reasons, especially since in this regard it simply repeated what was done at Ephesus I in 431. In the light of all this, first priority should be given in our discussions to whether or not the dogmatic decisions of individual synods are orthodox and not to whether or not the synods themselves are ecumenical. In a real sense even local synods are in nature ecumenical when the Orthodox faith is clearly proclaimed. One cannot fail to notice that Orthodox canon law makes frequent and precise provisions about the nature and function

of local synods, but no references to the canonical structure and function of an ecumenical synod which was extraordinary in nature and beyond the normal synodical system of the Church's life and teaching authority.

BISHOP SARKISSIAN: Would a new formula expressing our common understanding of Christology solve the problem? Would such a formula alone be considered as a sufficient basis for restoring our communion in faith? And, then, how do we deal with the other problems which sometimes are described as "minor"? I refer particularly to the problem of the Council of Chalcedon as such and to the later three councils considered Ecumenical by the Byzantine Orthodox Church.

PROFESSOR KARMIRIS: Only one tradition should be taken into account — the dogmatic one. All the other points should be subsidiary to the dogmatic tradition. This latter is common to both of us. Therefore, we must consider this sufficient for our union. No primacies of Patriarchs and Bishops need be discussed nor are we interested in changing the polity of the churches. Only in certain words and definitions do we disagree. It is sufficient to recall the difference between St. Cyril of Alexandria and John of Antioch, who differed in their formulation, without any real difference in their faith.

BISHOP EMILIANOS: But harmony of dogma may not be adequate. Are there any other doctrinal differences arising out of the other Councils?

PROFESSOR KARMIRIS: Chalcedon adopted above all the teaching of St. Cyril. The synod did not base itself on the Tome of Leo. The Tome of Leo is a piece of paper among many materials in the Council. Papal delegates asked for its adoption as definition but the Eastern fathers refused. Egyptians, Palestinians, Illyrians, all refused, including the bishops of Illyricum who were under the jurisdiction of Leo. We have our own fathers who are the true teachers of the faith.

There are no differences between the Councils of 431 and 451 in dogma. So also there is no difference between all seven Ecumenical Councils. The faith is one and the same in all the councils. All came out of the same common tradition of the first centuries. There is a continuity and unity of faith among the Seven Councils. So there are no outstanding problems between us, whether we accept three or seven.

The differences in liturgical forms, canon law, customs and practical issues, as well as in the names of certain fathers of the Church venerated by different churches, need not be a problem. These do not separate; the precise formulation of the Christological dogma is the only thing that needs to be done.

ARCHBISHOP TIRAN: Nationalism in the sense in which we understand it now may not have existed in the 5th and 6th centuries. Still, there was exploitation and domination of class by class, or ethnic group by ethnic group. There were peoples which were different from each other and were opposed to each other. There were territorial loyalties or oppositions. Syrian, Egyptian, Armenian social entities resisted the centralism of the Empire. These tensions, called by whatever name, played a large part in the quarrels touched off by the turn of events connected with the Council of 451.

I would also like to make a remark on the attitude of the Egyptian bishops in the Council. Their refusal to sign the definitions of the Council has ecclesiological significance. They did not consider themselves as independent individual bishops free to accept or reject the decisions. They thought of themselves as a corpus of Bishops under their head, the Pope of Alexandria. They considered themselves as representing a distinct national-territorial Church within the Church of Christ universal. They did not feel that they could act without their archbishop. It is perhaps this ecclesiological concept that developed into self-governing national churches of modern times. We could perhaps call this concept the collegiality of the bishops of a national church.

PROFESSOR ROMANIDES: But we must keep in mind that among the Greek speaking Orthodox there is no one national Church, but rather six autocephalous Churches and two semi-autonomous Churches. Constantinople, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Cyprus, Greece, Sinai, Crete, and the Dodecanese. The many provincial synods of the Roman Empire were already autonomous or autocephalous. In the ancient Church, as with the Greeks today, synodical autocephaly had nothing essential to do with national or ethnic identity. The same can be said about the Latin synods of the West before the German invasions. Italy, for example, had at least two autocephalous groupings of bishops with centers in Rome and Milan. When the Church of Russia became autocephalous at the end of the 16th century, the Orthodox of the Ukraine remained under the jurisdiction of Constantinople till the rise of the modern Orthodox idea of identity of nationality and autocephaly.

PROFESSOR KARMIRIS: The Orthodox Church has one basis of unity, formulated by Photius of Constantinople. "Whenever that which is violated is not the faith, nor there is a fall from the common and catholic decree, because other customs and laws are kept by others, he who knows how to judge rightly should not think that they who keep these fall into *adikia* or that they who do not accept them violate the law." Cultural differences need not divide the Church.

PROFESSOR SAMUEL: I should like to refer here to two minor points of difference between the paper of Professor Karmiris and the position of Severus of Antioch. For Severus, the word "nature" in both the phrases "from two natures" and "one incarnate nature" means *hypostasis*. But he makes it clear that, while taking the word "nature" in this sense, he excludes two possible erroneous interpretations. Thus, in the first place he rejects "two natures before the union," which he thinks is Eutychianism. Secondly, he renounces the idea of two conjoint natures, which for him is Nestorian *synapheia*. He then interprets the "from two natures" in this way. God the Son, an eternal nature or *Hypostasis*, when He became incarnate, individuated manhood in a hypostatic union with Himself. Therefore, the union was "from two natures," namely the eternal *hypostasis* of God the Son and manhood which was individuated in that union. In the union the natures converged into one *hypostasis*, and thus Christ is always "one incarnate nature or *hypostasis* of God the Word," or He is "one composite (*synthetos*) nature." Severus opposed the Chalcedonian phrase "in two natures" on the argument that it would imply only the idea of the

Nestorian *synapheia*. But he rejected with equal force the idea that Christ was "one ousia." In his view, it was not simply human nature that God the Son assumed, but a full individuated manhood. In spite of this terminological difference, we can see here agreement in the essence of the faith.

I was glad to hear Professor Karmiris say that conciliar decisions are permanently binding only when these decisions are dogmatic, not about non-dogmatic matters. This has many implications.

PROFESSOR FLOROVSKY: I should like to be an *advocatus diabolus* because I feel the need. First I am wholeheartedly in favour of a reconciliation between Eastern Churches, but I am not for over-emphasis on the East. Eastern ecumenism is a contradiction in terms. The West also belongs to the oikoumene. We cannot afford to forget the West — and the Tome of Leo. The Christian tradition is universal. The Byzantine Church was afraid of precipitating a schism by rejecting Leo. We must also be careful.

We must not over-emphasize confessional formulae and a direct intellectual approach. In practice we have to discuss the difficulties of plurality of practice, and the problems of psychological attitudes. Can we say that jurisdiction is not a problem for unity? That we need not have some central symbol of unity? Question of authority is important. Who can co-ordinate the various local or national churches? Who will prepare this confessional formula on behalf of the churches? We have to have a full meeting of the bishops on both sides. Who will convene this?

I have also doubts about agreement on the basis of a one-sided Cyrillic formula. I think it is important to come to terms with the later ecumenical councils.

PROFESSOR KARMIRIS: Professor Florovsky is right in speaking about authority. But glory be to God, all the Eastern churches have the synodical system, the competent organs of each church, with a presiding Bishop, Patriarch or Metropolitan. The question must first be discussed in all of these local synods. The text would have to be drafted by a working group and presented to all the synods of the churches. We can discuss this at Addis Ababa next January and at Rhodes in November. After discussion in two meetings it can be sent again to the churches for final ratification. Finally, all the bishops can come together in Council to finalize the decision. This is our Eastern synodical system of making decisions.

We should not have in mind the example of certain theologians or get bogged down in discussions of primacy and so on.

PROFESSOR NISSIOTIS: Inspired by our agreement, I would go further to say:

Something fundamental is revealed when we meet together. The dogmatic discussion is not an isolated piece. We both share in the dogmatic continuity of the churches. Our agreement is in the life of our churches, Christology — ecclesiology — anthropology are inseparable. And we have on both sides preserved this one tradition in its entirety; we are one in the whole of dogma — not just in one point. What is behind all this is the very profound understanding of the Holy Spirit in the Church. We have to make evident this common agreement in Pneumatology to the whole

oikoumene. The synodical system is not just a practical matter. It is the expression of our Christology and Pneumatology, our Eucharistic theology.

PROFESSOR SAMUEL: This is precisely why we consider ourselves Orthodox — not for prestige.

PROFESSOR KARMAKIS: St. John Damascene very clearly calls the non-Chalcedonians Orthodox in all matters with the exception of speaking of one *physis* after the union but not in the monophysite sense of one essence (*ousia*).

DR. KHELLA: The tragedy of Chalcedon is this: it had no formal conclusion as Ephesus 431. Our situation now is the same as, say, 432. If the reunion of 433 had not taken place, the 431 situation, that is the schism between Alexandria and Antioch, would have continued till now. But 451 did not come to a reunion formula.

In the period between 433 and 451 Cyril of Alexandria, John of Antioch and Proclus of Constantinople, the fathers and defenders of the union of 433, died. Their followers Dioscorus in Alexandria, Domnus in Antioch and Flavian in Constantinople did not trust each other. They brought the situation back to 432, as it was before the agreement of 433. It is very important to notice here that Leo of Rome was completely excluded from the discussion in the East: his later Tome was practically an arbitrary interference in matters which did not concern him.

One point which I like to emphasize in consideration of the paper of Professor Karmiris is that "*en duo physisin*" has no Greek tradition at all. It is surprising to find this coming out of Chalcedon. Chalcedonians would agree with us that "*ek duo phyeon*" is the more traditional formula. It is rather surprising that the Greek Church accepted this formula presented by Leo of Rome. Leo had little comprehension of the theological issue behind the two prepositions. Let us judge the issue on the basis of the Acts of the Council of 451, which seems to reject the *ek* in favour of *en*, after having almost accepted *ek*.

Our Church accepts all Greek Fathers up to Chalcedon, but then none of them spoke of two natures after the union. We do not need to spend time discussing the Christology of Eutyches; both sides reject him. In fact, he was not a qualified theologian though politically rather important. Eutyches was a monk; his asceticism demanded the disparagement of the body; Christ's flesh would be consumed by His spirit or by the power of the Logos.

Today we can rediscover our joint tradition and testimony which were interrupted for fifteen centuries. But 1500 years of separation need not become an insurmountable barrier. We have today the possibility of finding our common way to the expression of our unity.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

August 14th, 1964, Morning Session.

THE QUESTION OF RECONCILIATION AND REUNION BETWEEN THE ANCIENT ORIENTAL AND THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES

By THE REV. PROFESSOR VITALY BOROVY

The question pertaining to the ways and means of an eventual reunion of Christians in the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and in particular the reunion of the Oriental national churches which reject the Council of Chalcedon with the Orthodox Church which accepts the Council is not new. It appeared at the very initial stages of the schism.

Negotiations lasted, with interruption, for entire centuries; many varying and variously combined means and approaches were tried. The theological and historical materials related to this question are so numerous that it is easy to be misled by their very profusion.

It can be noted, however, that since the beginning and until our time, two types of approaches to the question prevailed in practice, which are known in the East as *henosis kat' oikonomian* and *henosis dogmatike*.

The first emphasized love as a way to union, the second rested on the search for Truth.

Love for each other was indeed the starting point of the first approach; it was leading the protagonists to close their eyes on the differences which separated them, to cover them with mutual tolerance and thus attain concord in mutual relations. The existing *status quo* both in faith and in discipline was accepted as the basis for such a unity, with hardly any concession being made by either side.

The first way towards union is also called in the West *unio conservativa*; the second *unio temperativa*. Both were covered by a *formula concordiae*.

The fundamental basis of the second type of union — the *henosis dogmatike* — was love for the Truth. Both sides jointly tried to establish on which side lay the Truth, the *akribeia ton dogmaton*. As a result of these joint efforts, one of the two sides renounced its errors, accepted the *akribeia ton dogmaton* and

agreed with the other in doctrine, and sometimes also in practice and discipline. Such a union was normally based upon a jointly accepted Creed or Confession.

Very frequently, however, the real impulsion which provoked unions of the first type — that is unions *kat' oikonomian* — was not in mutual love, but out of practical consideration, and very often, bitter necessity; disadvantages of schism, dangers which hung over the heads of one or both sides, mutual interests, etc. In fact, unions of this type were rather conditional agreements which led those who took part in them to maintain peace and good relations with each other, following certain conditions, while their actual life remained separate and there was no united Church. Since the agreements between the two sides were not aimed at solving their doctrinal and disciplinary differences, but at simply masking them, the latter soon reappeared and shattered artificially concluded unions, so that unions *kat' oikonomian* were always short-lived.

The *henoseis dogmatikai* possessed a quite different character. They led to real unions, so that the churches really became one Church, with not only a common faith, but also with common life. Such unions were solid and lasting.

Our conclusion is clear; the true Christian union is an *henosis dogmatike*. However, it is unfortunately difficult to achieve and it takes time. Many Christians were, and still are, attracted by the perspective of an *henosis kat' oikonomian*.

The error in all the union schemes of the past was that *one* of the mentioned theories — either the *henosis kat' oikonomian* or *henosis dogmatike* — was chosen as excluding the other. And since the one was always short-lived and the other was difficult to achieve the results of all past efforts were negligible.

What form of union shall we adopt in our unofficial conversations?

Clearly, a final goal should be the *henosis dogmatike*, a union in faith and in Truth. But the way towards such union must go through union in love, *henosis kat' oikonomian*. At the present stage of our rapprochement, we have not reached a joint agreement in faith; we must, therefore, concentrate all our efforts on the preparation and the realization of an *henosis kat' oikonomian*.

Every participant of our Consultation will present a report and all the materials to his ecclesiastical authorities.

The competent authorities of our churches are entitled, if they approve these reports, to consult the other sister-churches.

The Orthodox can discuss the issue at the forthcoming Pan-Orthodox Consultation on Rhodes, in November of this year.

Our brethren, who do not accept the Council of Chalcedon, can discuss the problem at their consultation in Addis Ababa in September.

If the results of these two consultations are positive, a joint theological commission could be formed. The commission will elaborate the right methods of further rapprochement. In particular, it could discuss and present for the approval of our churches:

- a. A list of theological, historical, historiographical and practical themes which need joint elaboration.
- b. Recommendations towards the formation of sub-commissions which would be entrusted with the task of working on individual problems and methodology.
- c. Projects for an exchange of church delegations, professors of theology and students.
- d. Projects tending towards necessary reforms in our theological curricula, especially in the fields of Church History, History of dogma, and Patristics, which would promote better and more objective understanding of issues, avoiding all polemical spirit.
- e. Projects dealing with mutual information about the life of our respective churches, exchange of articles, theological periodicals and literature.

When these preparatory steps will meet with the approval of our churches and will bring their first positive results, we shall be able to approach the next step in the preparation of our *henosis kat' oikonomian*. The joint commission will then have to elaborate the project of a Standing Conference of Eastern Orthodox Churches and present it for the approval of our respective ecclesiastical authorities.

The Standing Conference of Eastern Orthodox Churches will elaborate a common policy in our relations with the other Christian churches, families of churches, confessional alliances and international ecclesiastical organizations; e.g. a common policy towards the Roman Catholic Church, the Old Catholic Church, the

Anglican Communion, Protestantism, the World Council of Churches, etc.

The joint policy in our relations with the other Christian confessions and organizations, the common efforts in the defense and realization of this policy will bring our churches closer together so that we shall be able to initiate the process of passing from our *henosis kat' oikonomian* to an *henosis dogmatike*, a union in faith.

The Standing Conference will then appoint a joint commission of dogmatists, who will draft a common formula on the problem of Christology and the Council of Chalcedon.

After the approval of such a formula of agreement by the churches, a real *henosis dogmatike* will be realized, together with our *communio in sacris* and a common participation in the life of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, without prejudice to the jurisdictional independence and autocephaly of all our churches, which would keep their national historical characteristics.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

August 12th, 1964, Evening Session.

THE RECIPROCAL RELATION BETWEEN DOCTRINAL AND HISTORICAL FACTORS IN THE SEPARATION OF THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES FROM THE ANCIENT CATHOLIC CHURCH

By PROFESSOR G. KONIDARIS

The consideration of the historical circumstances of the separation of the Oriental churches from the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church in the 5th century is the best possible starting-point for the conversations between our separate churches and theologies which have been taken up within the realm of the ecumenical movement. For the knowledge of the historical background of the separation forms the indispensable presupposition for our studies.

With this I would like to express my agreement with the suggestion of the preparatory committee for an unofficial theological consultation between the Oriental churches and the Catholic-Orthodox Church. The view that many theological questions appear in another light when they are put in the proper historical context, should be modified in the sense that the separation can only be clarified and interpreted through historical investigation. Also the discussion of the theme, "how the statement of Cyril of Alexandria on the doctrine of the two natures of Christ must be interpreted today, *mia physis tou Theou Logou sesarkomene*," is basically a debate about a theme of the history of doctrine. Also the scientific, dogmatic presuppositions of our question are historical questions, for they are valid for the clarification not only of the historical situation, but also of the christology of the ancient church from the earliest times until the 4th Ecumenical Council (451).

The best method in my opinion is to follow the observation of the eminent Byzantinist Vasiliev which leads back to the historical background. He was of the opinion that the dogmatic decisions of the 4th Ecumenical Council at Chalcedon had a great political importance for Byzantine history. He was, however, also of

the opinion that the government of Byzantium, in its official reaction against the Monophysitism of the 5th century, led to its estrangement from the Eastern provinces of Syria, Palestine and Egypt, where the majority of the inhabitants were Monophysites. The Monophysites held fast to their dogmatic convictions, even after the condemnation by the 4th Ecumenical Council and would accept no compromise (451). The church of Egypt, by which he evidently means the indigenous congregations, had done away with the Greek liturgy and introduced the Coptic in its place. The religious anomaly in Jerusalem, Alexandria and Antioch, called into being by the forcible execution of the decisions of Chalcedon, developed in the form of national revolutions which were overcome and suppressed only after bloody battles.

The overcoming of the revolutionary crisis did not, however, solve the basic question of the time. For behind the religious differences, which increased in intensity with time, appeared intensive racial and cultural differences, mainly in Syria and Egypt. The non-Greek inhabitants of Egypt and Syria gradually came to the conviction that they must separate themselves from the Byzantine Empire. Vasiliev is of the opinion (S. 138) that religious disturbances in the Eastern provinces, which were strengthened by the structures of the population of these areas, created the situations and conditions in the 7th century which led to the surrender of the rich and cultivated provinces of the Orient into the hands, first of the Persians and then of the Arabs. The question whether this last view can be substantiated from the sources is one which we cannot, and do not wish to investigate here. The important thing is, however, that Nestorianism attained greater influence in the Orient, above all in Persia, and that according to Ostrogorsky's view "the opposition between the Byzantine Church with its doctrine of the two natures, and the Monophysite church of the Christian Orient became, from then on, the most urgent problem of ecclesiastical and national politics in the early Byzantine Empire." Monophysitism served as an expression also of the political as well as the religious separation of Egypt and Syria. It became the watch-word (or slogan) of Coptic and Syrian separatism in the struggle against Byzantine domination (S. 50). The Monophysitism condemned by Chalcedon won ever greater power in the Eastern world; in consequence, the dissension between the heart-lands of the Empire and its Eastern provinces became even sharper.

The political importance of the ecclesiastical question for the unity, economy and peace of the Empire and above all, of the Eastern border provinces and the military measures which the Empire had to adopt in order to strengthen and maintain the orthodox faith, led, for example, to new military measures in Alexandria with a view to the excommunication of the Monophysite, Timotheos Aeluros. Bloody battles were the result. The native population and the monks were Monophysites who removed Proterios, the Orthodox patriarch and pope of Alexandria — who had been elected by the 4th Ecumenical Council — from his throne. Chrysostomos Papadopoulos has said that the 28th of March, 475, was the saddest day in the history of the church of Alexandria. For on that day the Monophysite rabble stormed the palace Kaissarion and killed Proterios, although he had taken refuge in the baptistery of the church. His body was brought in triumph by the masses into the arena and burned (Theod. Anagn. P.G. 86, 169, Theoph. S. 110-111). The churches of the Orient also were indignant with the Monophysites, and the question of re-establishment of the peace and unity of the Empire in the border regions became ever acuter. The emperor entered the lists in favour of carrying out the dogmatic decisions of Chalcedon. He was orthodox. Marcian was under no illusions as to the danger that the border regions of Syria and Palestine could be lost. In the long run they could not be held. Perhaps only through a formula of compromise could the three areas be saved from the hands of the native revolutionary populace. This, then, had to be the aim also of the policies of the Empire. The compromise between Orthodoxy and Monophysitism was, however, possible only politically and not theologically. The policy was worked out in terms of expediency and advantage, and recognized no obligation to theological principle; in consequence, it could find the most suitable formulas and carry them into effect by means of the heavy hand of the state. The church, however, was bound to Scripture, to tradition and to the dogmas accepted by the three first ecumenical councils in their essential consistency. Therefore a policy which did not take seriously the question of truth in relation to the dogmas, i.e. to orthodoxy, or in some way disputed it, was impossible for the catholic church. The depreciation of the validity and ecumenicity of the 4th Ecumenical Council could not be maintained in the long run.

The Emperor Leo (457) asked the bishops, through a circular letter, whether they would acknowledge the 4th Ecumenical Coun-

cil, and what view they took of Timotheos Aeluros, who was active as the first patriarch of the Coptic Church of Alexandria (457-477, cf. list by Papadopoulos, S. 911). The answer of the bishops was that they were ready to accept the Council, and that they regarded Timotheos Aeluros not only as a murderer and an unworthy bishop, but also as unworthy even of the name of Christian (Nik. Kallistos 15, 16, Mansi VII, 530). Timotheos Aeluros (supported by the minister Aspar, who was a friend of the Monophysites) remained in Alexandria until the year 460 and then was banished to Gangra and the Chersonese. Leo of Rome was opposed to Timotheos Aeluros.

After this, Basiliskos became ruler of the Byzantine Empire. Without delay Basiliskos accepted Monophysitism and by his own uncircumscribed authority condemned, in an imperial circular letter, the decrees of Chalcedon and also the Tome of Leo (Euagrios 6, 101-104, 107). But this measure, which called forth the greatest indignation in Orthodox circles in Byzantium, hastened his fall. It is very characteristic that Timotheos was not an outspoken Eutychian, but maintained a theology of his own. The humanity of Jesus was neither essence (*ousia*) nor nature (*physis*), but "a law of the economy," which was not natural, but supranatural, "one nature (*physis*), one single divinity, although it was immutable." However, after Timotheos Aeluros had been restored to the throne of Alexandria by Basiliskos and had shortly thereafter died (477), the Orthodox patriarch was overthrown by military measures, and Petrus Mogos was elected as successor to Aeluros.

THE UNIFYING POLICIES OF THE EMPERORS FROM THE HENOTIKON OF ZENO (482) UNTIL THE 6TH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL

The unifying policy of the emperors was the result of a necessity of the Empire. For while the Duophysitism of the Nestorians was not so intelligible to the broad masses and therefore found no more than a national diffusion in Persia, Monophysitism proved more and more intelligible to the populace of the Oriental provinces. This can be well understood, since it emphasized the divinity of Jesus and the unity of His divine personality. It was this fact that led to the unifying policy of the Byzantine Empire. The responsibility of the emperors not only for the recovery of the provinces most important for the defense of the Eastern border of the Empire, but also for the economy of the European part of the

state, and the awareness of the emperor that the unity and integrity of the territory of the Empire must at all costs be preserved, led to a policy which, as a policy of compromise, called forth confusion in theological and ecclesiastical questions.

This policy which, after the Henotikon of Zeno (482), may be termed the Henotike policy (policy of unity), lasted, apart from periodic interruptions, for approximately 200 years (482-680). The unifying policy of the emperors, from the time of Zeno onwards, attempted to win the Orthodox and Monophysites for the Empire through theological and political compromise. The enforcement of the dogmatic decisions (*horoi*) of Chalcedon, as this was attempted in the years 451-457, resulted in a sharpening of the peril to the unity and integrity of the Empire since a considerable majority of the native population had gone over to the Monophysites. The collapse of the Empire would have come much earlier, if the emperors had not introduced this policy of union. The population of the large provinces of Syria, Palestine and Egypt, in their national resistance against the centre of the Empire, were not willing to accept the 4th Ecumenical Council.

The task of the emperors was to meet the desires of this population; but at the same time they were forced to satisfy the majority of the Orthodox who demanded the official acceptance of the Council by the Empire. In order to do justice to this double task — so valuable to the Empire, but also so difficult of accomplishment — they sought a compromise formula which could serve their political purposes. The unity of the Empire based on the spiritual and ethical unity of the catholic church, was in danger as long as the unity of the church was not a reality.

It is not possible to go into the details of this policy of the emperors Zeno (after 482), Anastasius I, Justinian, Heraklios, Constantine II, for that would lead too far afield. But it is necessary to say that the compromise formula served the purpose of moving the Orthodox and the Monophysites of the Eastern provinces to unity. This was an impossibility from a spiritual and theological, i.e. ecclesiastical viewpoint, for it led necessarily either to the rejection or to an indirect denial of the 4th Ecumenical Council. The temporary success of the policy of union in some regions, for example in Palestine under the patriarch Martyrius, or the approval of this policy on the part of some patriarchs under Justinian I and Heraklios, could not in the long run be maintained.

For the decisions of Chalcedon were the logical extension of the decisions of the earlier ecumenical councils.

* * *

It is possible and perhaps right to say that the policy of insuring the integrity and the peace of the Empire through the union of Christians, theologically and ecclesiastically indefensible, required as its basis a political theology, namely the theology of the emperors. Justinian himself, and later Constantine V, had each his own theology, while the theological grounding of the politics of the other emperors is to be sought in the circle of their counsellors.

It is easy to understand why the theocratic state of the early Byzantine period was, in its church policies, concerned for the true faith of its subordinants, with a view to the fulfillment of its own interests. Orthodoxy was a public question and therefore the intervention of the emperor in theological questions is understandable. The decisions of the Ecumenical Councils always had political importance in relation to the peace and prosperity of the Empire. The intervention of the state in theological questions could, however, bring confusion with it. And the compromise formula of the imperial ordinances really did contribute to obscurities.

Thus the historical factors are of great importance in the separation of the Eastern churches. The compromise policy of the emperors proved impossible to maintain. The provinces were lost to the Empire almost for ever. One can finally maintain that the unifying policy suffered a double failure:

1. Politically: the provinces are lost; whether, and to what extent the population of these provinces can be made responsible is a question which is still open to debate.

2. Ecclesiastically: the ratification of the decisions of the 6th Ecumenical Council (680/1) by the emperors implied a clear admission on the part of the state that the "political theology" was incorrect, for the decisions of this council are the direct confirmation of the decisions of the 4th Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon.

It can be said that the solution of the christological problem as it was undertaken by the Ecumenical Councils until the 6th Council shows an inner logical consistency. It is based on Holy Scripture and tradition and on a free and eclectic, and therefore correct, application of philosophical concepts.

The politics of the Empire finally recognized the solution of the christological question which the theology of the catholic church had prepared and formulated.

* * *

This contribution is to be understood as a preliminary sketch. Later on it will be worked out in detail.

DISCUSSION: Concerning the Paper of Professor Konidaris

ARCHBISHOP TIRAN: It seems that non-theological factors played a decisive role in the dogmatical disagreement. It seems that the Byzantine Emperors imposed their opinion and used the Church for their political purposes.

DR. KHELLA: The same history that Professor Konidaris presented to us can be presented by us in a totally different way. It is well known that the martyrs in Alexandria are not the Chalcedonians but the non-Chalcedonians, who were violently persecuted.

PROFESSOR KONIDARIS: We cannot say on account of the theocratic system of Byzantium that the Emperors imposed their will. The great thing is that in matters of dogma, especially during the period between Zeno and 680, Orthodoxy always prevailed in the end. The political factor never had the last word, but the true dogma of Orthodoxy.

FATHER VERGHESE: Is it only during this period that this "henotike policy" of the Emperors prevailed within the Byzantine Empire?

PROFESSOR KONIDARIS: This was the policy especially during this period, but the beginnings of it are to be found in Constantine the Great, who based the unity of the peoples of the Empire on the unity of the Church. He named himself "Bishop of things outside the Church" (*ton ekatos*). This policy was definitely crystallized with Theodosius the Great who acknowledged the Orthodox "Catholic" Church as the official Church of the State (Const. 380 and 381). The faith of the citizens, however, was finally formulated by the Second Ecumenical Council (the creed of Constantinople including that of Nicaea).



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

August 13th, 1964, Afternoon Session.

ST. CYRIL'S "ONE PHYSIS OR HYPOSTASIS OF GOD THE LOGOS INCARNATE" AND CHALCEDON¹

By THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN S. ROMANIDES

Both Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian Orthodox accept St. Cyril as the chief Patristic exponent of Orthodox Christology. Yet both accuse each other of not remaining completely faithful to Cyril.

The non-Chalcedonian Orthodox reject the Council of Chalcedon and accuse it of Nestorianism because it accepted the *Tome of Leo*, *two natures after the union*, and allegedly omitted from its definition of faith such Cyrillian expressions as *One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate, hypostatic or natural union, and from two natures or from two One Christ*. The failure of Chalcedon to make full use of Cyril's *Twelve Chapters*, to condemn the Christology of *Theodore*, and its acceptance of *Theodoret* and *Ibas* throws suspicion on it. Then there is the weighty accusation that the very act of composing a new definition of the faith contradicted the decision of Ephesus (431) which decreed that, "It is unlawful for anyone to bring forward or to write or to compose another Creed besides that determined by the Holy Fathers assembled with the Holy Spirit in Nicaea."²

The Chalcedonian Orthodox, on the other hand, believe that it was Cyril's Christology which was not only fully accepted at Ephesus, but served as the basis of all judgments concerning Christology at Chalcedon in 451 and especially at Constantinople in 553. In spite of its obvious deficiencies the *Tome of Leo* is adequately Orthodox, definitely not Nestorian, and was accepted only as a document against Eutyches, but again only in the light of and in subordination to the synodical letters (especially the *Twelve Chapters*) of Cyril to Nestorius and John of Antioch, as we shall see. The terminology and faith of Cyril were fully accepted, although the Eutychian heresy, the chief concern of the Council,

¹ This paper presupposes familiarity with the article mentioned in note 4, p. 85.

² *Mansi*, iv, 1361.

called for some adaptation to the new situation. One may point out that the acceptance of the Chalcedonian definition was no different from the acceptance of Cyril's letters at Ephesus. Neither the one act nor the other can be considered as a composition of a new Creed. They are both interpretations and clarifications of the Nicaean faith in the light of modern circumstances. It is noteworthy that even Cyril had to defend himself against the accusation that he accepted a new Creed in his reconciliatory correspondence with John of Antioch.⁸ Theodoret and Ibas were restored to the episcopacy because they accepted Ephesus I and especially the *Twelve Chapters*, which acceptance is in itself a condemnation of what they had written about and against Cyril and his anathemas. The Fifth Ecumenical Council of 553 anathematized the writings of Theodoret and Ibas against Cyril and the very person of Theodore, the Father of Nestorianism.

The non-Chalcedonian Orthodox have been for centuries accusing the Chalcedonian Orthodox of being Nestorians. On the other hand, the Chalcedonians have been accusing the non-Chalcedonians of either being monophysites (which for them means believers in *one ousia in Christ*) or of a one-sided insistence on Cyrilian terminology to the exclusion of Cyril's own acceptance of two natures in the confession of faith of John of Antioch which brought about the reconciliation of 433. This one-sidedness was adopted by the Ephesine Council of 449 and rejected by the Council of Chalcedon. It should also be noted that the Flavian Ende-mousa Synod of 448 was one-sided in its use of and insistence on the Cyrilian terminology of the 433 reconciliation to the near exclusion of Cyril's normal way of speaking about the incarnation. From Chalcedon and especially from Constantinople II it is clear that the Chalcedonians without compromise allow for variations in terms which express the same faith. On the non-Chalcedonian side Severus of Antioch seems to be the only one who comes close to Cyril's acceptance of *two natures tei theorai monei* after the union, a position adopted at Chalcedon and clearly stated in the definition or anathemas of the Fifth Ecumenical Council.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss a few terms against the historical background of circumstances which called them up to serve as a test of correct faith. Especially important are the circumstances surrounding the Councils of 449 and 451. Undoubtedly

⁸ P.G., 77, 188.

a key figure which conditioned Dioscoros' exasperation with all talk of two natures was its extremely clever use by Theodoret to hide what one may call a clear case of crypto-Nestorianism. Leo's support of and failure to see through Theodoret made him guilty by association, as in some measure happened with Dioscoros' support of Eutyches. This explains a good deal of the negative attitude toward Leo's tome, not only from Egyptian quarters, but also from the Palestinian and, of all people, the Illyrian bishops, who were within Leo's own sphere of ecclesiastical influence.

The key to the approach of this paper is (1) to define Nestorianism as seen by Cyril in order to determine why Cyril could accept *tei theorai monei* two natures in Christ after the union and John's confession of faith, and then (2) to examine very briefly in the light of this definition Leo's Tome and the attitude toward and use of it by Chalcedon. In Part II we will examine what is clearly a case of crypto-Nestorianism in the person of Theodoret, and in the light of this we will survey some of the important aspects of the Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian encounter with this issue. Throughout the paper we will be concerned with the place of Cyril, and especially his *Twelve Chapters*, at Chalcedon, thereby determining whether or not the Fifth Ecumenical Council is really a return to or rather a remaining with Cyril.

PART I

1) Nestorius rejected the fact that He Who was born of the Virgin is consubstantial with the Father according to divinity and thus by nature God. Another way of saying this is that he rejected the fact that He Who before the ages is born from and is consubstantial with the Father was in the last days born according to His Own and proper humanity from the Virgin Mary having become thus by nature man and consubstantial with us. On the basis of this rejection Nestorius distorted the true significance of the title *Theotokos* which he in reality denied to the Mother of God. The most Nestorius could say is that Christ is the one person of the union of two natures, the one nature being by nature God and the other by nature man. The name Christ is not properly predicated of the Logos, but is the name of the person of union born of Mary and in whom the Logos dwells and who was assumed by the Logos. Nestorius fanatically insisted that the Logos was not born of the Virgin according to His Humanity and did not, therefore, become by nature man. On the basis of this he

divided the natures and predicates of Christ attributing the human to the assumed man and the divine to the Logos.

In the light of his denial of the two births of the Logos and the double consubstantiality of the One and the Same Logos, Son of God and the Self-Same also Son of Mary, and thus of the true meaning of the title Theotokos, Nestorius' insistence that he does not divide Christ into two persons, but only the natures and names, was judged a mockery of the faith and on this basis he was condemned by the Third and Fourth Ecumenical Councils and rejected by John of Antioch and Leo of Rome.

I have indicated elsewhere⁴ that the reconciliation of 433 between Cyril and John was brought about by the Antiochene's confession of the double birth and consubstantiality of "our Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God," the very doctrine rejected so violently by Nestorius and even by Theodoret, as we shall see shortly. In his confession John clearly declares that the *Only-begotten Son of God* was "before the ages begotten from the Father according to His Divinity, and in the last days the *Self-same* (ton auton) for us and for our salvation, (begotten) of Mary the Virgin according to His Humanity, the *Self-same* (ton auton — note that he is here speaking clearly about the Only-begotten Son and not the Nestorian and Theodoretan Prosopon of the union of two natures) consubstantial with the Father according to Divinity and consubstantial with us according to Humanity."⁵ For Cyril this confession of faith meant that the title Theotokos and the incarnation were accepted in their full and true significance, in spite of the fact that John spoke of "a union of two natures, whereby we confess One Christ, One Son, One Lord."

In his letter to Acacius of Melitene⁶ Cyril is quite emphatic about the fact that this Antiochene confession of the double birth and double consubstantiality of the One and the Same Logos cannot be suspected of Nestorianism since this is exactly what Nestorius denies.⁷ To the objection that two natures after the union

⁴ See my article, "Highlights in the Debate Over Theodore of Mopsuestia's Christology," in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, vol. v, no. 2 (1959-60), pp. 157-161.

⁵ *Mansi*, iv, 292.

⁶ P.G., 77, 184-201. See also *Ep. ad Eulogium*, P.G., 77, 224-228; *Ep. ad Successum I and II*, P.G., 77, 228-245.

⁷ P.G., 77, 189-192, 197.

means a predication of two separate kinds of names, divine and human, to two separate natures, Cyril replies that to divide names does not mean necessarily a division of natures, hypostases, or persons, since all names are predicated of the one Logos. The division of names is considered as a safeguard against Arians and Eunomians who by confusing them sought to demonstrate the creatureliness of the Logos and His inferiority to the Father. The names, and not the natures, are divided in order to distinguish the real difference of the natures or things out of which Christ is composed, and not to divide them, since they can be distinguished after the union in contemplation.⁸

Of course Cyril prefers to speak of *One Nature or Hypostasis of God the Logos Incarnate and become man*, since this better safeguards the union and the attribution of all things pertaining to Christ to the Logos as the subject of *all* human and divine actions. For Cyril *Physis* means a concrete individual acting as subject in its own right and according to its own natural properties. Thus the One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate, having by His second birth appropriated to Himself a perfect, complete and real Manhood, has as His Own both the ousia and natural properties common to all men, whereby it is the Logos Himself Who is Christ and lives really and truly the life of man without any change whatsoever in his Divinity, having remained what He always was. To speak about two natures in Christ would be somewhat equivalent to a Chalcedonian speaking about two Hypostases in Christ. In this respect a Chalcedonian would accept and does accept everything Cyril says but would use Cyril's *One Hypostasis of God the Logos Incarnate*, since for him *Physis* means *Ousia*.

The one very essential point which Cyril makes and which some day may be given adequate consideration by the non-Chalcedonian Orthodox is that whatever one's insistence on theological accuracy in expression may be, it is sheer caricature to accuse anyone of being Nestorian who accepts the double birth and double consubstantiality of the Logos as the basis for the title Theotokos, as well as for the predication of all human and divine attributes and energies to the Logos Who is the sole subject incarnate and acting, both according to His Divinity and His Own appropriated Manhood. This is what Theodore, Nestorius, and Theodoret de-

⁸ P.G., 77, 193-197.

nied and this is the essence of Orthodoxy. St. Cyril saw this clearly and it is our duty to place this at the centre of our discussions.

2) There is no doubt that Leo tended to separate or distinguish the acts of Christ in such a way that the two natures seem to be acting as separate subjects, a tendency explainable by what he imagined Eutyches was teaching and by his Latin formation wherein Greek Trinitarian terms used in Christology were not available to him. He so obviously failed to understand how the term *One Nature* was being used in the East, and especially during the Endemousa Synod of 448. This is why a non-Chalcedonian reading the Tome should read *ousia* upon coming across *natura*, since Leo was dealing with the information he had received that Eutyches denied Christ's consubstantiality with us. His expression of utter amazement that the judges did not severely censure Eutyches when making such a statement as, "I confess that our Lord was from two Natures before the Union, but after the Union I admit but one Nature," confirms the confusing of his own *natura* and the Greek *ousia* with *physis*. Then Eutyches' own confusion of the terms *ousia* and *physis* did not help the matter any.

Nevertheless, Leo is very clear in his acceptance of the anti-Nestorian standard of Orthodoxy accepted by Cyril. Leo declares clearly in his Tome that "the Self-same, who was the Only-begotten and Everlasting One of the Everlasting Parent, was born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary. And this birth in time takes away nothing from that divine and eternal birth, nor does it add anything to it. . ."⁹

The definition of Chalcedon is also clear in this respect. "Following, then, the holy Fathers, we all unanimously teach that our Lord Jesus Christ is to us One and the same Son, the Self-same of a rational soul and body; consubstantial with the Father according to the Godhead, the Self-same consubstantial with us according to the Manhood . . . before the ages begotten of the Father according to the Godhead, but in the last days, the Self-same, for us and for our salvation (born) of Mary the Virgin Theotokos according to the Manhood. . ."¹⁰

Returning to Leo's Tome it is important to point out that at Chalcedon it was accepted only as a document against the heresy

⁹ T. H. Bindley, *The Ecumenical Documents of the Faith* (London, 1950), p. 224.

¹⁰ Mansi, VII, 116.

of Eutyches, in spite of the fact that both Leo and his legates believed it to be a good statement against Nestorius also. It is even more important to keep in mind that during its reading at Session II the three now famous Nestorian sounding passages were each one challenged as the document was being read. During each interruption it was attacked and defended by the use of parallel passages from Cyril.¹¹ After what must have been a somewhat stormy and long debate, bishop Atticos of Nikopolis in Old Epirus, Greece, made the motion that time out be taken to give the assembly the opportunity to carefully compare Leo's Tome with the *Twelve Chapters* of Cyril in order to make sure of what they were approving.¹² The imperial representatives chairing the meeting gave the bishops five days in which to do this and suggested the formation of a committee under the presidency of Anatolius, Patriarch of Constantinople.¹³ The committee reported back at the fourth session, at the beginning of which the imperial and senatorial representatives declared the unswerving faith of the emperor in the expositions of Nicaea, Constantinople, and Ephesus with its approval of the "two canonical letters of Cyril," i.e., the Second and Third to Nestorius.¹⁴ This profession of the imperial faith had been made also at the end of Session I,¹⁵ and now in anticipation of the committee's report on the question of Leo's agreement with Cyril's *Twelve Chapters* it was repeated. The committee report¹⁶ was included in the minutes in the form of a listing of the individual opinions of its members, all of whom expressed their belief that Leo's Tome agreed with Nicaea, Ephesus, and the letter of Cyril. Most of the bishops mentioned the (one) letter of Cyril,¹⁷ which cannot be any other than the *Twelve Chapters* since this was the one the Illyrians and Palestinians were concerned about as is clear from the motion of the Illyrian Atticos which initiated the careful comparison of Leo's Tome with the letter of Cyril. Some of the members mentioned their belief that the Tome agreed with the two letters of Cyril, clearly referring to the ones of Ephesus mentioned as part of the imperial faith. It is ex-

¹¹ *Mansi*, VI, 972-973.

¹² *Mansi*, VI, 973.

¹³ *Mansi*, VI, 973.

¹⁴ *Mansi*, VII, 8.

¹⁵ *Mansi*, VI, 937.

¹⁶ *Mansi*, VII, 48.

¹⁷ *Mansi*, VII, 36-45.

tremely interesting to note that among the similar individual opinions given by the rest of the Assembly and recorded in the minutes is that of none other than Theodoret of Cyrus,¹⁸ who claims that he finds the Tome of Leo in agreement with the letters of Cyril and the Council of Ephesus, certainly a tremendous leap from his position just before the Council. In the light of his strong hesitation at Session VIII to anathematize Nestorius, a hesitation which infuriated the assembly, one wonders about his sincerity, especially since he tried to defend his former acts by an exposition of how he never taught two Sons. He was interrupted by shouts of "Nestorian."¹⁹

The acceptance of Leo's Tome in the light of and in subordination to the letters of Cyril is also clearly contained in the Chalcedonian definition itself.²⁰ It is declared that the Council accepts the Synodical (the Third letter to Nestorius is titled synodical, or since this is in the plural it could be a reference to the two of Ephesus, which in the minutes are called canonical, plus the one to John) letters of Cyril to Nestorius and to those of the East, "and to which (epistles) it reasonably adapted the letter of Leo . . . (epistolas . . . hais kai ten epistolen tou Leontos . . . eikotos synermose . . .)." This is not a case of a balance between Cyril and Leo, as many scholars would have us believe. Leo became very sensitive about the doubts raised about his tome, and especially disturbed did he become over determined opposition in certain quarters like Palestine where Juvenal was deposed for accepting the Tome. In a letter to Julian of Cos (cxvii, 3) in which he shows much concern with accusations of heresy against himself, he writes that, ". . . if they think there is any doubt about our teaching, let them at least not reject the writings of such holy priests as Athanasius, Theophilus and Cyril of Alexandria, with whom our statement of the faith so completely harmonizes that anyone who professes consent to them disagrees in nothing with us." No one can doubt the sincerity with which Leo wanted to be in agreement with those Alexandrine Fathers, but his defense of Theodoret compromised him. In a letter to the now restored Bishop of Cyrus he chides Theodoret for the tardy way in which he anathematized Nestorius (cxx, 5), yet in his opening remarks

¹⁸ *Mansi*, VII, 20.

¹⁹ *Mansi*, VII, 188-192.

²⁰ *Mansi*, VII, 113.

of this very same letter he speaks of "the victory you [Theodoret] and we together had won by assistance from on high over the blasphemy of Nestorius, as well as over the madness of Eutyches." Dioscoros' relationship to Eutyches may have some parallels.

The Chalcedonian definition also speaks of itself as "preserving the order and *all* the decrees concerning the Faith passed by the Holy Synod held formerly at Ephesus. . . ."²¹ From Ibas' *ad Maxim Persam* and from the minutes of the Johannine Council of Ephesus, we learn that the Antiochenes rejected the Cyrillian Council of Ephesus and damned Cyril because the heretical *Twelve Chapters* had been accepted.²² In this same letter Ibas (as were many of Cyril's friends and Theodoret)²³ was under the impression that Cyril abandoned his Ephesine position in his reconciliation with John in 433.²⁴ However, Ibas stated at his trial in Byretus in 449 that Paul of Emessa had accepted the Alexandrine bishop's interpretation of the *Twelve Chapters* as Cyril had accepted the confession of the Easterners.²⁵ It is in the light of this that one should read the letter of John to the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Constantinople (the order of the letter) in which he announces Antioch's acceptance of Nestorius' excommunication and the Council of Ephesus.²⁶ It is impossible to accept the opinion of many that Cyril laid aside his *Twelve Chapters* for the sake of a reconciliation with John. As an individual he had no authority whatsoever to modify the decisions of an Ecumenical Council and there is no evidence to substantiate this supposition. Although the Endemousa Synod of Constantinople seems to have overemphasized the Cyrillian allowances of 433, it accepted the *Twelve Chapters* as part of Ephesus which it approved *in toto*.²⁷

In the light of the evidence it is clear that Cyril's Third letter to Nestorius, including the *Twelve Chapters*, was not repudiated by Chalcedon as many claim. On the contrary, the *Twelve Chapters* were used as the very basis of the Council's attitudes toward Nestorianism and Leo's Tome. It is too bad that the Chalcedonians themselves present at the Council of 531 in Constantinople

²¹ *Mansi*, VII, 109.

²² *Mansi*, IV, 1265 ff.; VII, 244-245.

²³ *Ep. CLXXI, P.G.*, 83, 1484.

²⁴ *Mansi*, VII, 248.

²⁵ *Mansi*, VII, 240.

²⁶ *Mansi*, V, 285.

²⁷ *Mansi*, VI, 665.

did not fully realize the crucial role played at Chalcedon by Cyril's *Twelve Chapters*. Their answer to Severus' accusation that the *Twelve Chapters* were laid aside in 451 was that it was accepted and approved as part of Ephesus I. This, of course, is uncontested, but not anywhere near the reality of the matter. The significance of the use made of the *Twelve Chapters* at Chalcedon should be obvious enough to those who claim that they fail to find the terms characteristic of Cyrillian Christology in the definition. Groundless also are the theories (brought forward by many Protestant and Roman Catholic scholars embarrassed by the Cyrillianism of the Fifth Ecumenical Council) concerning an alleged neo-Chalcedonian movement which was supposed to have put Leo's Tome aside and returned to the *Twelve Chapters* of Ephesus I, especially to the *twelfth anathema*. The truth of the matter is that in pronouncing anathema on those who do not accept the *Twelve Chapters* of Cyril, the Fifth Ecumenical Council of 553 is simply repeating what was done at Ephesus in 431 and again at Chalcedon in 451.

PART II

Now we must turn to the crypto-Nestorianism of Theodoret, a type of Christology which in some measure can hide itself behind the language used in the formulary of reunion of 433, without, however, adopting its exact wording and meaning. It was undoubtedly his exasperation with this type of Antiochene Christology more than anything else which goaded Dioscoros into setting aside Cyril's act of 433 and returning to what may be called Alexandrine exclusiveness as the only sure means of uprooting the new form behind which Nestorianism hid itself.

In the course of the Christological controversies Theodoret learned to modify some of his opinions without, however, changing his basic vision and presuppositions. For example, he rejected Cyril's suggestion that the Logos Himself became by nature man,²⁸ but by the time he wrote his *Eranistes* he had adapted, to some degree, his language to that of Cyril. In some contrast to Nestorius he claims that "the Truth is both God by nature and man by nature."²⁹ In another work he says that "the Same is by nature God and man."³⁰ He Who was born of the Virgin, according to

²⁸ *Ep. De XII Capitulis*, P.G., 76, 388A.

²⁹ P.G., 83, 121B.

³⁰ *Demonstraciones*, P.G., 83, 328A.

Theodoret, is consubstantial with the Father according to His Godhead and consubstantial with us according to His Manhood. Christ was born, says the bishop of Cyrus, before the ages from God the Father and in our own time the Selfsame Christ was born from the Virgin Theotokos.³¹ These expressions are not those of Nestorius, yet they are not completely Orthodox. The name Christ, for Theodoret, is predicated of the Logos because the Only-begotten Son of God assumed a man or manhood which was born from the Virgin.³² Until his acceptance of the Third and Fourth Ecumenical Councils, Theodoret could not say that the Logos Himself, being by nature God, became according to the flesh by nature man, or consubstantial with us, by His second birth in time from the Virgin Mary, while remaining immutably what He was. Such a double birth and the double consubstantiality must be predicated of Christ alone and not the Logos. Only divine names can be predicted of the Logos.³³ Yet all names, both human and divine, can be predicated of Christ because of the union in Him of the two natures.³⁴ Thus, when Theodoret says that He Who was born of the Virgin is consubstantial with God the Father, he does not mean that He Who is consubstantial with the Father was born of Mary in the flesh. The name Christ seems to be the only one Theodoret allows to be predicated of the Logos in the flesh, and by means of this he avoids saying with Nestorius that Christ is the Son of David and Son of God united in His (Christ's) One Person. Yet he clearly follows Nestorius by distinguishing the Only-begotten Son and Christ in the Creed by insisting that the name Jesus Christ, and not the title of Only-begotten Son, is the recipient of the things human such as birth, suffering, death, burial and resurrection.³⁵ His attempt to explain why only the name Christ of all things human should be predicated of the Logos in the flesh is a Nestorian failure. Thus it was the prosopon of Christ Who suffered, died, and was buried in the tomb, not the impassible Logos in His Own passible manhood.³⁶ When St. Paul speaks of the Lord of Glory being crucified he means that the body of the

³¹ P.G., 83, 1420.

³² P.G., 83, 264B; 280-281.

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ P.G., 83, 148AB; 252CD; 231A.

³⁵ P.G., 83, 280BCD-281B.

³⁶ P.G., 83, 257CD; 261BCD.

Lord of Glory was crucified, not that the Lord of Glory was crucified in the flesh.³⁷

Very instructive on the question of dividing the names between the two natures and uniting them, not in the Logos, but in the name Christ, which includes the Logos, is Theodoret's version of the formulary of reunion or Antiochene confession of faith. The linguistic variations between the confessions are doctrinally quite revealing. We will quote Theodoret's version³⁸ and insert in their proper places within brackets and in capitals the longer text of John and underline the one phrase in Theodoret's creed missing from that of John.

"We confess one Lord Jesus Christ, (THE ONLY-BEGOTTEN SON OF GOD), perfect God and perfect man, of rational soul and body, before the ages begotten of the Father according to Godhead, but in the last days (THE SELF-SAME) for us and our salvation, of Mary the Virgin; the self-same consubstantial with the Father according to Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to Manhood."

For John it is the Only-begotten Son of God Who has a double birth and a double consubstantiality, whereas for Theodoret these can be predicated only of Christ, Who includes the Logos, since only the single divine birth and consubstantiality can be predicated of the Logos Himself. It seems highly doubtful that Theodoret is the author of the formulary of reunion as is commonly claimed.³⁹ On occasion he may profess agreement with John's confession, but then he professed agreement with the Nicæan Creed also. On the basis of this crypto-Nestorianism Theodoret could continue his attacks on Ephesus and Cyril, and especially on the *Twelve Chapters*. It is very important to point out that Theodoret's Christology is not that of John accepted by Cyril, nor that of Leo's Tome and Chalcedon. Failure to realize this during the fifth century made both Leo and Chalcedon guilty by association

³⁷ P.G., 83, 280AB.

³⁸ Ep. CLI, P.G., 83, 1420A.

³⁹ Also doubtful on the basis of his Christology is Theodoret's alleged authorship of what seems to be a letter sent by Domnus to Flavian (P.G., 83, 1297). See R. V. Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon* (London, 1953), p. 28, n. 5) in which it is confessed that all things pertaining to Christ, although predicated of two natures, are attributed "to the One Only-Begotten."

in the eyes of those who followed the lead of Dioscoros, in the same way that Dioscoros was made guilty by association by his support of Eutyches.

Keeping in mind Theodoret's distinction between the titles Christ and the Only-begotten Son for the purpose of denying that the Nicaean Creed speaks of the Only-begotten Son Himself as born, suffering, crucified and buried, it is instructive to turn to Leo's Tome. The bishop of Rome, in clear contrast to Theodoret and Nestorius, writes, "that the Son of God is said to have been crucified and buried, although He suffered these things not in His Godhead itself, in virtue of which the Only-begotten is both co-eternal and consubstantial with the Father, but in the weakness of Human nature. And this is the reason why we all confess, too, in the Creed that 'the Only-begotten Son of God was crucified and buried' in accordance with that saying of the Apostle, 'For had they known they would not have crucified the Lord of Majesty'" (ch. 5). If this is not *in toto* what Cyril is saying in the *Twelfth Anathema* of his *Chapters*, it at least is certainly not what Nestorius or Theodoret were saying. In the opinion of this writer, Theodoret's acceptance of Leo's Tome in his need for help against personal disaster is no different from his acceptance of Cyril's *Twelve Chapters* at Chalcedon. He was a sorry sight at the eighth session trying to publicly convince the assembly that he was not now accepting all that was done and anathematizing Nestorius because of any love of honour, rank and wealth.⁴⁰

As long as Cyril and John were alive they were able to contain somewhat the extremists in their respective dioceses (*dioikeseis*). Even the eruption of the controversy over the Christology of Diodore and Theodore did not break up the union of 433. However, things changed for the worse with the accession of Domnos (443) to the "Apostolic See" of Antioch and Dioscoros (444) to the "Evangelical See" (so they are called in the minutes of the Councils) of Alexandria. Theodoret got the upper hand in Antioch and pro-Nestorian activities increased seriously. Evidently at Theodoret's instigation several Nestorians were ordained bishops, including the notorious Nestorian fanatic Count Irenaeus the twice married. Thus the Church was faced with a resurgence of a Nestorianism hiding behind the formulary of reunion and Theodoretan Christological double-talk. Again we must keep in

⁴⁰ *Mansi*, VII, 188-192.

mind that these people not only professed faith in the formulary of reunion, but also in the Nicene Creed, both of which they interpreted in their own way.

At the time Cyril accepted John's confession there were many who were highly suspicious of the two nature document, either feeling that Cyril had compromised the decisions of Ephesus or believing that Cyril had been tricked. They no doubt felt that now their suspicions had been justified. It was now natural for them to feel and decide that the only way to uproot this new Nestorianism was to insist on *One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate, One Nature after the Union*, and that Christ is *One from or out of two Natures*. Only this would make it possible to insure the attribution of all the names and activities of Christ to the Logos Incarnate. The Theodoretan type experience had proven to them beyond all doubt that any doctrine of two natures after the union could only mean two subjects and centres of activity in Christ acting in a harmony of wills, the one or the other performing its proper operations as the need arose. As we shall see he assailed even those who could accept *One Nature of the Logos Incarnate*, but who preferred to speak of *two Physeis* which to them meant *two ousiai*.

The opportunity for a decisive blow at two natures was presented by the Endemousa Synod of Constantinople in 448 which was convened to deal with the accusation of heresy filed against Eutyches by Eusebius of Dorylaeum. The libel itself contains no specific heresy, but according to the witness of those sent to invite Eutyches to attend the Council in order to answer to unnamed charges, the aged Archimandrite denied that Christ is consubstantial with us according to manhood.⁴¹ The same denial was repeated by Eutyches when he finally made a personal appearance at the Synod. However, when told that this is a denial of the teaching of the Fathers (perhaps some Patristic quotations were shown to him) he faltered and showed some willingness to accept this teaching. However, it is interesting to note that he was several times asked as one question what perhaps should have been asked as two separate questions, viz. whether or not he confesses (1) that Christ is consubstantial with us, and (2) that after the incarnation there are two natures in Christ.⁴² There seem to be no indi-

⁴¹ *Mansi*, VI, 700-701; 741.

⁴² *Mansi*, VI, 737; 808; 816.

cations from the minutes (except possibly in Leo's observation that no one reprimanded the monk when he spoke of *One Nature* after the union) that these two statements could have different meanings, viz. that it may be possible to speak of One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate or one nature after the union, and at the same time confess that Christ is consubstantial with us according to His Manhood. Thus, although Eutyches could seriously entertain the possibility of accepting the teaching on consubstantiality, he could not for a moment think of anathematizing those who teach One Nature after the union. Thus when the two questions were thrown at him as one he could only refuse to anathematize. It seems quite clear that for Eutyches (whose case seems to be one of simple ignorance), as well as for Eusebius and Flavian, *physis* was synonymous with *ousia*. Eutyches was excommunicated, but either during the Synod or later he appealed his case to the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Thessalonica.

Although Eutyches was quite defendable in his refusal to anathematize those who teach One Nature Incarnate of the Logos, since, as he said, he could not anathematize the Fathers of the Church, he could not be defended for his denial that Christ is consubstantial with us. Thus it was not after this Synod that Dioscoros accepted Eutyches into communion. This could not be done until the question of Christ's consubstantiality was cleared up. This doctrinal deficiency was done away with on the basis of added testimony presented to the Review Conferences of April 449 convened to examine Eutyches' claim that the acts of the Endymousa Synod which condemned him were inaccurate and lacking.

Presbyter John, who, together with the deacon Andrew (with another deacon, Athanasius, happening along), was sent to invite Eutyches to the Endemousa Synod, and had then testified that Eutyches denied that Christ is consubstantial with us, now claimed that in private, while the other two were not listening, the Archimandrite expressed his belief that *Christ is consubstantial with His mother*, although not with us.⁴⁸ When asked why this information was withheld in 448 Presbyter John answered that he had done this because the other two had not witnessed to this part of the conversation. The presbyter's testimony is peculiar since Eutyches did say that the mother of Christ was consubstantial with

⁴⁸ *Mansi*, vi, 785.

us.⁴⁴ If he believed that Christ was consubstantial with his mother, this would, as it seems, make Him consubstantial with us also. It is interesting to note that Flavian himself uses the phrase that Christ is consubstantial with His mother in his confessions of faith.⁴⁵

It is very important to realize that at this Review Conference it was established, truthfully or falsely, that Eutyches was excommunicated for refusing to anathematize those who say One Nature after the Union and for refusing to accept two natures after the Union. Constantine the deacon, one of Eutyches' advocates at the hearing, accused Flavian of doing just this.⁴⁶ The Patrician Florentius vigorously challenged the truthfulness of the acts which pictured him as attempting to get Eutyches to accept two natures after the union as though this only were Orthodox dogma.⁴⁷ There is also evidence indicating that on the basis of Cyril's *One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate* it was felt that Eutyches must agree with the bishops assembled.⁴⁸ This evidently meant that they felt Eutyches should accept a second nature in Christ since this is what to them *Incarnate* meant. Of course, this would be true if *Physis* meant *Ousia*, but this is not how Cyril used the term in this phrase. He could not and never does speak of *One Ousia of God the Logos Incarnate*. This paralleling of Cyril's *One Physis* with *Incarnate* in order to prove that Cyril speaks of *Two Physeis* in Christ was and is a mistake repeated by all Chalcedonians till today. The approach was and is a bad one since it could only lead to two *Hypostases* and *Prosopa*. Nevertheless, Eutyches was not restored to communion as a result of this Review Conference, either because Presbyter John's testimony was not accepted, or because Eutyches refused to accept two natures after the union.

What is of great significance from the foregoing is the fact that the Council of Ephesus of 449 was not heretical since Eutyches' exhortation was obviously based on his confession that Christ is consubstantial with His mother. This explains why Anatolius of Constantinople at the Fourth Ecumenical Council could in plenary session claim that Dioscoros was not deposed

⁴⁴ *Mansi*, v, 1233; vi, 741.

⁴⁵ Sellers, *op. cit.*, pp. 130-131.

⁴⁶ *Mansi*, vi, 808; 816.

⁴⁷ *Mansi*, vi, 808-809.

⁴⁸ *Mansi*, vi, 813.

for heresy.⁴⁹ The Ephesine Council of 449 was rejected at Chalcedon because of the injustice done to Flavian and Eusebius, and the exhortation of Eutyches. On the other hand Theodoret and Ibas, who were also deposed at Ephesus in 449, were restored at Chalcedon as late as sessions eight, nine, and ten, and then only after they accepted all that had thus far been done at the Council and anathematized Nestorius. Even though Leo's legates considered Theodoret as a participant from the very beginning,⁵⁰ the assembly vigorously protested.⁵¹ The result of the protest can be seen in that the imperial representatives informed the protesting Dioscoros that the bishop of Cyrus was admitted to the Council in the capacity of accuser only.⁵² We recounted his restoration elsewhere.⁵³ It should be noted that Atticos, the bishop of Nikopolis in Old Epirus, who made the motion which brought about the careful comparison of Leo's Tome with Cyril's *Twelve Chapters*, was present at Theodoret's restoration and the Epirot's acceptance of it is another testimony to the Bishop of Cyrus' submission to Cyril.⁵⁴

Another objection, and perhaps the most serious, which Chalcedonian Orthodox have with the Ephesine Council of 449 is its rejection of Cyril's allowance for two natures after the union and its one-sided exclusiveness in this regard. This comes out clearly in the fact that at the Flavian Synod of 448 the minutes of Ephesus were read and accepted⁵⁵ and also by the fact that both Flavian and Eusebius accepted *One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate* so long as Christ's consubstantiality with us is clearly professed.⁵⁶ However, Dioscoros simply rejected all talk of two natures after the union. When the imperial representatives asked why Flavian was deposed since he did accept *One Nature of the Logos Incarnate*, Eustathius of Berytus admitted making a mistake.⁵⁷ Dioscoros, however, claimed that Flavian contradicted himself by accepting two natures after the union.⁵⁸ The strange thing is that both

⁴⁹ *Mansi*, VII, 104.

⁵⁰ *Mansi*, V, 589.

⁵¹ *Mansi*, V, 592.

⁵² *Mansi*, V, 644-645.

⁵³ *Mansi*, VII, 188-192. See remarks in text of this article at note 19, page 89 above.

⁵⁴ *Mansi*, VII, 188.

⁵⁵ *Mansi*, VI, 665.

⁵⁶ *Mansi*, VI, 637; 676-677.

⁵⁷ *Mansi*, VI, 677.

⁵⁸ *Mansi*, VI, 681.

were correct, since for Flavian *physis* meant *ousia*, whereas for Dioscoros it meant *hypostasis*. Nevertheless, knowingly or not Dioscoros was bent on erasing what Cyril had done in 433.

In confronting Eutyches' denial that Christ is consubstantial with us Flavian and Eusebius were clearly speaking of two *physeis* as equivalent to two *ousiae*. For them double *consubstantiality* meant two natures. For Eutyches *physis* and *ousia* were also synonymous and he evidently at first believed that Cyril's *One Nature* meant *One Ousia*, hence his hesitation to accept them as names for Christ's humanity. Cyril does use *ousia* and *physis* as synonymous when speaking of the Holy Trinity.⁵⁹ There is no question of course about his use of *physis* as equivalent to *hypostasis*. Yet he never speaks of there being one *ousia* in Christ and clearly speaks of the flesh of Christ as being consubstantial with ours.⁶⁰ In Christology he uses *physis*, *hypostasis*, and *prosopon* as synonymous, yet he never, as far as I know, speaks of Two *Proso-pa before the union and one after*, as he does with the other two terms. Equivalent to his *One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate* is his *One Hypostasis of God the Logos Incarnate* of his *Third Letter to Nestorius*⁶¹ and his *Defense of the Twelve Chapters*.⁶² In the light of all this and all which was said at Chalcedon, the anathema pronounced in the definition on those who say *two na-tures before the union and one after the union* was intended for anyone with Eutyches who denied that Christ is consubstantial with us. There is no doubt that the definition should have contained the phrase *or ousia* as one finds after the phrase *one physis* in the eighth and ninth anathemas of the Fifth Ecumenical Council. This would have avoided much misunderstanding. It perhaps was not done at the Fourth because possibly Cyril's *One Nature of God the Logos* was taken as equivalent to *One Ousia* and the word *Incarnate* as equivalent to a second *ousia or physis*. That this was possible is borne out clearly by the Flavian Synod of 448, as well as the explanations given by both Eusebius and Flavian at Ephesus in 449, as we have already indicated.

It should be noted that *One Hypostasis of God the Logos Incarnate* and not *One Physis of God the Logos Incarnate* is to be

⁵⁹ E.g., *Ad Monachos*, P.G., 77, 17.

⁶⁰ Mansi, VI, 677.

⁶¹ P.G., 77, 116.

⁶² *Apologia Cap. II*, P.G., 76, 401A.

found in Cyril's *Third Letter to Nestorius* approved by Ephesus and Chalcedon. These terms are, of course, absolutely synonymous for Cyril. Yet it seems very obvious that at the Flavian Synod of 448 and at Chalcedon, the true Cyrillian meaning or usage of *One Nature* was overlooked simply because the phrase *One Nature after the union* was not contained in the synodical letters of Cyril which alone were familiar to all participants of both Councils.

At the Endemousa Synod of Constantinople in 448⁶³ and in his confession of faith of 449 Flavian says that Christ is *out of or from two natures*.⁶⁴ Yet he spoke in the same breath of two natures after the union. At the Council of Chalcedon Dioscoros vigorously rejected any talk of a *union of two natures* (as found in the formulary of reunion approved by Cyril) and insisted exclusively on a *union out of or from two natures*. For Dioscoros this meant that after the union there could be only one nature. Had this term had the same function for Flavian as it did for Dioscoros, the bishop of New Rome would have found himself believing with Eutyches in *one ousia after the union*, since for him *physis* meant *ousia*. Nevertheless, the imperial representatives were so impressed by the fuss Dioscoros made over this question, that they used this as an example to convince the bishops of the need of drafting a statement of faith. It is at this point that Anatolius intervened to remind the assembly that Dioscoros was not deposed for heresy, but because he excommunicated Leo.⁶⁵ In their interlocution at the fifth session the imperial representatives said that Leo says *union of two natures* whereas Dioscoros says *union out of two natures*. "Whom do you follow?" they asked. The Reverend Bishops cried, "As Leo, thus we believe. Those who gainsay are Eutychinists."⁶⁶ In the light of what happened in sessions two and four with Leo's Tome, one wonders if a deliberate attempt was made with the minutes to make Leo look a little better at Chalcedon in order to offset the obvious humiliation he underwent. Keeping in mind the Council's subordination of Leo to Cyril one must take seriously the fact that in the letters of Cyril which served as the basis of the Council's deliberations the terms *from two natures* or *from two One* occur several times. It is understandable that Dioscoros made this a big issue and it so became sub-

⁶³ Mansi, vi, 680.

⁶⁴ Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

⁶⁵ Mansi, vii, 104.

⁶⁶ Mansi, vii, 105.

sequently. One can understand the imperial representatives trying to make the question look like a big victory for Leo. Attila had to be met by the force of an empire united in everything and especially helpful was the bishop of Rome who must not now be humiliated. But even when in *two natures* is accepted as the original reading of the Chalcedonian definition (although from *two natures* is what the manuscripts contain), it should be taken as an anti-Eutychianist statement meaning in *two ousiai*, since this is what had been denied. Thus the Fifth Ecumenical Council rejects as heretical from *two natures* only when its proponents mean to teach *one ousia* in Christ. It stands to reason that had anyone proposed in *two natures* in the sense of rejecting Cyril's from *two natures* he would have certainly been challenged. Anatolius' reply to the imperial representatives is indicative of the fact that the leaders of the Council were not in any mood to see in these phrases any contradiction, and in fact there were none. Would the non-Chalcedonian say that Christ is *out of two ousiai* in the same way he says *out of two physeis*? If not then he can't expect a Chalcedonian to do what he won't. What is then left is to speak of Christ as of *two ousiai* or in *two ousiai*. This is all a Chalcedonian means by of *two natures* and in *two natures*. It seems that bickering over such terms was the result of a heresy hunting temper which lumped Leo and Theodoret into one theological camp because of the alliance between them.

Also one may point out that *hypostatic union* or *natural union* were accepted at Chalcedon by virtue of the fact that all done at Ephesus in 431, the most important part of which are Cyril's letters wherein are contained all his key terms and ideas on Christology, was incorporated together with Cyril's letter to John and the Tome of Leo into the definition itself. It seems obvious enough that the Chalcedonian theologians of the fifth and sixth centuries should be taken very seriously when they point out that Chalcedon was not convened in order to condemn Nestorius, except by way of repeating what had been done so well at Ephesus in 431, but rather in order to deal with the Eutychianist heresy.

The Theodoretan crypto-Nestorianism, whose danger loomed so large in Alexandrian circles, was not at all grasped by Leo. In a similar fashion the danger of Eutychianism was not handled properly by Dioscoros. We must always keep in mind the serious imbalance of attitudes toward issues on each side. While the Chalcedonians concentrated on the *confusors of the ousiai* in

Christ, the Alexandrians were still fighting the *separators of natures or hypostases*. In the light of this it would be wise to make allowances in terminology while none whatsoever in faith. I would suggest that serious consideration be given to the Fifth Ecumenical Council, not as one which modified Chalcedon, but as one which interprets it correctly. If we agree on the meaning of Cyril's Christology, we should also be as pliable as he on terms. In this regard the non-Chalcedonians should accept all of Cyril, including 433, and the Chalcedonians must stop overemphasizing the Cyril of 433.

DISCUSSION: Concerning the Paper of Father Romanides

FATHER MEYENDORFF: I am glad that Father Romanides speaks this time in this positive way about the Tome of Leo, and I hope the non-Chalcedonians will read him in this light. The praises of Leo in the Acts of Chalcedon should be seen as a conciliatory move in the light of the anti-Roman bias of the Chalcedonian Canons.

FATHER ROMANIDES: It is my opinion that the adoption of Trinitarian terms in Christology was in the beginning rather accidental. At the Council of Alexandria in 362, presided over by St. Athanasius the Great, it was decided to adopt the Cappadocian manner of distinguishing between *hypostasis* and *ousia* when speaking about the Holy Trinity. No decision was made concerning the term *physis* which, until the Cappadocian distinction came into existence, was synonymous for all practical purposes with both *hypostasis* and *ousia*. The outcome of this was that the Cappadocian tradition ended up by equating *physis* with *ousia*, while the Alexandrian tradition equated *physis* with *hypostasis*. The accidental nature of this equating of *physis* with either *hypostasis* or *ousia* must be taken seriously into consideration in order to understand the history of the Christological debates between 448 and 451 as described in my paper. In the self-justifying heat of polemics after 451 each side claimed a monopoly of understanding of the precise meaning of the term *physis* which from the point of view of the history of dogma is untenable. Failure to realize this can only lead us back to the ridiculous debate concerning the superiority of one's own Fathers over the Fathers of the other side. We must be very clear about the fact that the Chalcedonians mean two *ousiai* when they speak of two *physeis* after the union, whereas the non-Chalcedonians, as pointed out very clearly by Father Samuel's paper also, do not mean *one ousia* when they speak of *one physis* after the union.

FATHER MEYENDORFF: *Physis* was seen by all as signifying concrete being. The Antiochene Christology insisted upon the idea that the concrete actions of Christ can be variously ascribed to humanity and divinity, the subject being one — the Christ.

FATHER ROMANIDES: But Cyril would attribute everything to the Lo-

gos in the flesh, not simply to the Christ as is done by the Nestorianizers and pointed out in my paper.

FATHER VERGHESE: What do we mean by Christ being in two *ousiai* after the union?

FATHER ROMANIDES: In both the Cappadocian and Alexandrian traditions the *ousia* of God is beyond all categories of thought in a radical manner and therefore not only beyond definition of any kind, but also beyond the predication of any name whatsoever, to such an extent that God is *hyper-onymos*, *hyper-ousios* and even *hyper-theos*. Within this Biblical tradition the *ousia* of man also remains a mystery. Only the energies and powers of both God and man can be known. In this sense the term *ousia* is used not in the Greek philosophical sense of the definable and knowable immutable inner reality of a thing, but as concrete unknowable reality known only in its acts. In contrast to the Antiochene and Latin tradition (the Augustinian one), the term *ousia* as applied to the Holy Trinity by the Cappadocian and Alexandrian Fathers is neither a platonic superstratal genus, nor an Aristotelian substratal material in which the hypostases or persons of the Holy Trinity participate. Therefore, Christ being in two *ousiai* could only mean that our Lord, the Only-Begotten Son of God, exists in two concrete, yet undefinable and perfect and complete realities, each of which is by nature proper to Himself and distinguishable in the union in thought alone. The term *in two natures* is of Latin provenance and was translated by the Cappadocian oriented Fathers of Chalcedon by the phrase *in two phyeis*. Under more normal conditions the Alexandrians might have accepted the term in their own theological language as *in two ousiai*. It is only in this anti-Eutychian sense that the non-Chalcedonians must understand the term *in two phyeis* whose only intent is to preclude *one ousia* after the union.

FATHER SAMUEL: I am quite pleased with this paper of Father Romanides from several points of view. First, I am pleasantly surprised that Theodoret is not defended by the paper. Secondly, Ephesus (449) is not condemned outright. The paper is much fairer at this point than most Western church historians. Some difficulties remain for anyone reading the minutes of the Council. They do not give me the same impression as they give Father Romanides. Take, for instance, the Third Letter of Cyril to Nestorius with the Twelve Anathemas. At Chalcedon it was not read. The imperial commissioners referred to the two canonical letters of Cyril read and approved at Ephesus in 431. But the letters of Cyril read at Chalcedon were only his Second Letter to Nestorius and his Letter to John of Antioch, or the Formulary of Reunion of 433. So from the point of view of reading, the Third Letter with the Anathemas was passed over in silence. There were two references to it at Chalcedon. One: the intervention of Atticus of Nicopolis who wanted to compare the Tome of Leo with the Twelve Anathemas. And two, the Chalcedonian Formula includes it, by implication, among the documents of the Faith.

How, then, can Father Romanides say that the Twelve Chapters of Cyril were in the mind of the Council when it accepted the Tome of Leo?

FATHER ROMANIDES: Father Samuel is correct in saying that the *Third Letter* of St. Cyril to Nestorius containing the *Twelve Chapters* was at first passed over in silence. However, after the reading of Leo's *Tome* the suc-

cessful demand was made that it be compared with the *Twelve Chapters* of St. Cyril in order to see whether or not it was Orthodox. We should not overlook the fact that the overwhelming majority of bishops at Chalcedon were Cyrillians and so were able to force the issue of the *Twelve Chapters* as the criterion of Leo's faith. After Chalcedon even Leo attempted to calm his enemies with the claim that he himself was absolutely Cyrillian (see e.g. his Ep. cxvii, 3). I think one should simply check the references to the minutes in my paper for documentation of the evaluations made.

FATHER SAMUEL: I am glad to hear you say that the *Twelve Chapters* were accepted by Chalcedon, though this is far from clear in the minutes.

In the matter of Ibās, for instance, the Roman delegates said that they had read his letter to Maris the Persian and that in spite of it they considered him Orthodox.

FATHER ROMANIDES: But Ibās was reinstated on the basis of his formal acceptance, sincere or not, of the *Twelve Chapters*.

FATHER SAMUEL: Besides, if I may continue, there is no basis for the statement that Dioscorus accepted Eutyches into communion if by this a serious charge is intended to be made against Dioscorus. There are several difficulties here. In the first place, we have to clarify the meaning of the word "communion" or *koinonia*. It can mean either Eucharistic communion or simply friendship and support. What is to be proved, if it can be raised as a charge, is that between the Home Synod of Constantinople in 448 and the second Council of Ephesus in 449 Dioscorus offered Eutyches Eucharistic communion. Do we have any evidence for it? Secondly, in none of the petitions against Dioscorus presented to the Council of Chalcedon was this mentioned. The only reference to it is found in the declaration against Dioscorus made by the Roman delegation. They said that Dioscorus had offered *koinonia* to Eutyches before the latter was rehabilitated at Ephesus in 449, without specifying what they meant by the word *koinonia*. Thirdly, while stating why Dioscorus had been condemned, Anatolius of Constantinople did not mention this as a charge against Dioscorus. Thus if at all one has to take the words of the Roman delegation seriously, they mean only that Dioscorus supported Eutyches.

But we appreciate your paper and its general trend.

FATHER ROMANIDES: In this regard the only point I wish to make in my paper is that Dioscorus supported Eutyches as one who accepts the double consubstantiality of the Only-Begotten Son of God. Only this can explain why Dioscorus' Orthodoxy was upheld at Chalcedon. On the other hand, Dioscorus was deposed for excommunicating Leo and also for acting uncanonically. I was not concerned specifically with the type of support Eutyches received from Dioscorus, although this is in itself of great importance.

BISHOP SARKISSIAN: In our new effort which aims at a deeper and more adequate understanding of the Council of Chalcedon than what we have been accustomed to in the past, we must not overlook the whole emotional, psychological climate in which the Council evolved and the political factors and tensions which were operative elements in the course of the Council. As the great majority of the bishops were Cyrillians in

their theological thinking, it was strange that the Tome of Leo was taken as a standard formulation of Christology. There are several other aspects in the minutes of the Council which need to be taken into consideration in a well-balanced presentation and evaluation of the spirit and the content of the Council. In this paper, some important aspects, such as the role of Leo's Tome, the rehabilitation of Theodoret and Ibas are overlooked and only the positive elements and aspects have been taken into account. We need a fuller evaluation of the Council as a historical event.

FATHER ROMANIDES: I am surprised at some of the claims of oversight, since much of my paper is devoted to the role of Leo's Tome, the Christology of Theodoret and its relation to Leo's Christology, and the manner in which Theodoret and Ibas were rehabilitated at Chalcedon. I am also amazed that at this point in our conversations Leo's Tome is still referred to as "a standard formulation of Christology" at Chalcedon. It is easy for you to use the Latin interpretation of Chalcedon as a stick against us, but if we are to get anywhere you will have to take the Greek Chalcedonian interpretation of the place of Leo's Tome at the Fourth Council more seriously.

DR. KHELLA: In interpreting the Acts of Chalcedon it is unrealistic to expect agreement on our two sides. This paper is historically more or less accurate in what it says, but the data have been chosen from a particular perspective. As Bishop Sarkissian said, we need a more balanced study of the Acts. As for a few inaccuracies, e.g. on page 83, it is not true to say that Severus was the first to agree on two natures "in thought." Timothy Aelurus was just as correct in this regard, also Peter the Iberian and others. On pages 87-90, I feel that the role of Leo at Chalcedon should be clarified. The numbers given of bishops at Chalcedon are often legendary. Perhaps there were more than 360 bishops in fact, of whom only 7 were from the West. Two North Africans who were fleeing from the invasions were by accident at Chalcedon. There was also the Apocrisarius of Leo in Constantinople. Two others from the West spoke no Greek. These were the ones who wanted the Tome of Leo to be read.

The letter was read in a smaller committee in which only 23 bishops were present. Latin Acts have different numbers from the Greek Acts; but the Tome was not read in the second session. The session of 13th October is difficult to regard as a full session.

FATHER BOROVY: I was afraid of this entry into the jungle of details from which there may be no easy way out. I wanted rather to count on my fingers the achievements of this day. Father Meyendorff's last two points in his paper are a definite achievement. When I heard Father Samuel saying "we are not monophysites," this was another achievement. When Bishop Sarkissian spoke of the *communicatio idiomatum* this was another achievement again. When finally I heard Professor Karmiris I felt we were very close to each other. It seems we should be able on this basis to find a uniting formula. Perhaps we are too enthusiastic and we should speak a little bit as Professor Florovsky did (as *advocatus diabolus*). I would continue in that negative line. Is there a dialogue here, or a dual monologue? We sincerely accept the defense of our non-Chalcedonian brethren for their past. Our side can also present a similar defense. If we take this line,

the next step will be polemics. We say we are individual theologians. I do not consider myself as such. My Church sent me here to speak on her behalf — not for polemics, but for unity. I am here to find the common ground as suggested in Professor Karmiris' paper. All contributions on the Chalcedonian side bear an ecumenical spirit. They seek a meeting point, and even perhaps went further. The spirit of Cyril is strong. We are not against him. But we are the Church, but not the church of Cyril or Leo or Theodoret or anybody else. The Church is above them all. We need not accept everything of Cyril. His fundamental Christology is important; but no need to reject Leo and Theodoret in their positive contributions.

Historically, we should not seek to defend our own sides. History has no angels of light, nor purely dark devils. In history we find men acting, holy men, to be sure, but still men. Even in Nestorius there are many positive aspects. We must recognize both the merit and the weakness of both sides. The Holy Spirit works in the Church as a whole.

We must look for the ground of unity. The details can be worked out by a commission.

PROFESSOR ROMANIDES: There is no doubt, as Bishop Sarkissian and Professor Khella point out, that my paper is written from a certain point of view. It only happens that this point of view is that of the overwhelming majority of the Council which accepted Leo's Tome only in the light of St. Cyril's *Twelve Chapters*. That this should be the normal outcome at Chalcedon cannot be surprising when one takes seriously the historical fact that the Latins and Antiochenes, who were the only ones who unconditionally supported the Tome, were a small minority at the Council.

I am very happy to hear that Severus was not the first one on the non-Chalcedonian side who could accept *two natures tei theorai monei after the union*. There are no indications from the minutes of the Ephesine Council of 449 that Dioscoros could accept this. Nevertheless, I should like to point out that I was not asked to write a book on Chalcedon, but only ten pages which became seventeen. The purpose of the paper did not include any discussion of such technical problems concerning the number of sessions, bishops, etc. I cannot accept the idea that Session II could have debated Leo's Tome without it having first been read. The cruciality of the debate over Leo's Tome at Session II can be seen in the fact that the bishops were given five days in which to examine St. Leo's faith in the light of St. Cyril's *Twelve Chapters*. Session IV continued the discussion and the acceptance of Leo's Tome only in the light of St. Cyril is clearly seen in the recorded opinions of the bishops and reflected in the Chalcedonian definition itself. These are incontrovertible facts and no manipulation of the minutes can mitigate their importance.

I think a very basic difficulty which we Chalcedonians of the Greek tradition face is that there is a peculiar theological alliance between the Latin (including Protestant) and non-Chalcedonian scholars in regard to Chalcedon. For the same reasons that the Westerners can accept Chalcedon, the non-Chalcedonians reject Chalcedon. Both sides try to prove that Chalcedon rejected the *Twelve Chapters* of St. Cyril and accepted Leo's Tome either as a correction (so say the Westerners) or as a distortion (so say the non-Chalcedonians) of Cyrilian Christology. Con-

trary to both these approaches (which do not represent the central tradition of Chalcedon) the Chalcedonian Greeks read the documents of Chalcedon in the light of Ephesus I (431) and Constantinople II (553). The usual Latin and non-Chalcedonian picture whereby our Illyrian, Thracian, Asian, Pontian, Cappadocian, Palestinian, and Egyptian Fathers are presented as capitulating before a few Latin and Antiochene bishops is caricature and not history.

In regard to the welcome remarks of Father Borovoy I would like to add that my paper is not a defense of Chalcedon, whose shortcomings I try to indicate, nor is it a defense of the non-Chalcedonian position. Rather it is an attempt to understand how the two traditions survived the complexities of history while always maintaining essentially the same Orthodox faith. Such a study so obviously calls for the tracing in history of the common central intuition of faith and doctrine which could not be distorted by the tragedies of our respective histories. This fact is living testimony to the meaning of continuity in truth which is not imposed by any external authority but which is the fruit of communion with the source of truth. To try to avoid the complexities of history when dealing with each other can lead only to a false sentimentalism which can never and will never lead to unity and can be no more effective than an ostrich burying her head in the earth to solve her immediate problems. Whether we like it or not we are christologically the Church of Cyril because Cyril's Christology is that of the Bible, the Fathers, and the Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Ecumenical Councils. The anti-Cyrillian works of Theodoret on Christology were condemned by the Fifth Ecumenical Council and Leo's Tome was never accepted as a definition of faith. Cyril's *Twelve Chapters* are definitions of faith.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

August 14th, 1964, Evening Session

A STATEMENT MADE BY HIS GRACE MAR THOMA DIONYSIUS

I stand here, not as an active participant in the deliberations of the week, nor as a specialist in matters of modern scholarship in Patristic Theology. I thank God for bringing us together for this consultation, which, let us hope, will lead to the healing of our age-long breach in the Church, the Body of Christ our Lord. Our gratitude goes to the World Council of Churches for their Christian goodwill in making this consultation possible.

I have been listening with deep interest to the various sincere and open discussions and clarifications of the issues involved in the breach during the week. I have no hesitation in stating optimistically that God's Holy Spirit has been guiding us all along the right path towards the goal of unity and peace in the Orthodox Church.

In regard to the division of the Chalcedonian and the non-Chalcedonian bodies, which has been the subject of our discussion here, I must admit, I belong to neither of them. From my own personal point of view, I hold to the ancient Orthodox faith. From one aspect of the matter, I should consider myself pro-Chalcedonian. But from another aspect I have to assume the opposite stand.

The point I make is this. On more than one occasion I had to pronounce anathema against Eutyches, I mean at our ordinations and consecrations. Having done this publicly and traditionally on several occasions, I am convinced of the seriousness of Eutyches' heresy.

Like the other heresies of the Church, such as Arius, Macedonius and Nestorius, Eutyches ignored the supreme fact that matters relating to our Lord, especially his *Qnomo* (personality), his *Kyono* (nature) and his Will are divine mysteries. These heretics were no doubt thinkers and one of them, Nestorius, was the Patriarch of Constantinople. But their failure was due to their reliance on their own intellectual ability. They failed to realize that a Heavenly Mystery is always beyond the scope of comprehension by mere human intellect; and consequently, they

stood by their own individual conclusions. St. Augustine in his ignorance of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity was saved by divine revelation and not by his personal thinking.

Now, Eutyches by his teaching declared that the human nature of our Lord was confronted with His Divine Nature and eventually was destroyed in that confusion. He was reported to have said that our Lord's Divine Nature was like a vast ocean and the Human Nature was only like a drop of honey which was lost in the vast ocean of water. Again some said that he compared Christ's Human Nature to a drop of cold water on a piece of red-hot iron. All this may or may not have been truly said by him. Eutyches became conspicuous and popular by his teaching. This was nothing less than cutting at the roots of our Lord's incarnate union of Godhood and Manhood. He had believed that the Son of God, the Word, came down and took flesh from the Virgin Mary; but his fall from the fundamental truth of the Incarnation was the cause of his teaching being anathematized.

Arius taught that Christ our Lord was not God but only a creation of God. The Council of Nicea condemned him. *Macedonius* taught that the Holy Ghost was not God. The Synod of Constantinople anathematized him. *Nestorius* declared that our Lord was born as a human baby, not as God; that His humanity and His divinity were two parallel distinct persons in Christ. The Holy Orthodox Church taught that Christ was born as God and died as God. Hence the Blessed Virgin Mary was declared the Mother of God.

Eutyches, who was the head of a large monastery in Constantinople, opposed Nestorius and wanted to confirm Christ's one person and he had the support of some of the Fathers in his true faith and teaching. But apparently his enthusiasm for the oneness of Christ's personality deteriorated into the heterodox and heretical view of the oneness of Christ's divine nature devoid of His human nature. He ignored the fact that:

1. Our Lord was born and grew and lived and worked as man;
2. Our Lord called Himself the *Son of Man*;
3. At His baptism, God the Father proclaimed Him *Beloved Son*;
4. At Transfiguration the same heavenly proclamation asked us to *accept Him as such*;
5. In Gethsemane He was grieved and prayed as man;
6. He suffered and cried on the cross likewise;

7. He rose and ascended in His human body;
8. His Blood is interceding in Heaven for us. It is the Blood of His human body;
9. We are looking forward for the second coming of the Lord in His human body.

Eutyches fell from these truths. Hence the Church of God pronounced anathema on his teaching and will continue to do so.

Now there is another aspect of Chalcedon for our consideration: the two things, one nature and two natures in Christ, have been disturbing God's Church, particularly the Orthodox Church in India. The Western church in some places holds to the two natures and condemns the Oriental non-Chalcedonian church as monophysite. This situation we oppose as unfair to the *purpose of God*. Since the fall of Adam, God and man became aliens. In reconciliation between God and man, God the Father sent to the world the Redeemer, His only begotten Son.

The act of redemption was the atonement (at-one-ment) — God one with man — God-man — man one with God — Man-God. Christ by the process of atonement is both God-man and Man-God. Divinity and humanity have been joined in one. Union of Human and Divine Nature have become one united nature. Those who teach two persons in Christ and those who believe two separate natures after the mysterious union in Christ, we say, are not orthodox, but heterodox.

UNION OF NATURES IN ORTHODOX VIEW

Our Lord has had His divine nature and human nature in their own properties without confusion or mixture joined together hypostatically, never to be separated as two natures after the union. This is the Church's teaching. It is ignorance and unfairness on the part of those who stigmatize the Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian as Nestorian and Monophysite. Now both of the branches of the church have, by the great mercy of God, come to a better understanding and clearer interpretation and are orthodox in the true sense of the word.

What next? For a lasting connection or communion between the two sections, the following may be helpful:

1. Closer and frequent contact between the churches through visits of their heads and theologians and priests;
2. Exchanging theological literature and taking an active part

in common worship, each church faithfully maintaining its own national and traditional characteristics, customs, rules, etc.;

3. Enlarged study of literature in Greek, Russian, Syrian, Arabic and other languages wherever possible;
4. Preparation of a missionary scheme and training of more members for the mission field in the country and outside;
5. Regular prayers of intercession for the churches.

I beg your prayers for the distant church of India, so that God may prosper it, its priests and its people. Let us all be one Holy Catholic Orthodox Church — one Christian East.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

UNOFFICIAL CONSULTATION BETWEEN THEOLOGIANS OF

EASTERN ORTHODOX AND ORIENTAL ORTHODOX CHURCHES

AUGUST 11-15, 1964

PAPERS AND MINUTES

EDITED BY

JOHN S. ROMANIDES

PAUL VERGHESE

NICK A. NISSIOTIS



THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME X, NUMBER 2

WINTER 1964-1965

\$3.00

**UNOFFICIAL CONSULTATION BETWEEN
THEOLOGIANS OF EASTERN ORTHODOX
AND ORIENTAL ORTHODOX CHURCHES**

UNOFFICIAL CONSULTATION BETWEEN THEOLOGIANS OF EASTERN ORTHODOX AND ORIENTAL ORTHODOX CHURCHES

AUGUST 11-15, 1964

PAPERS AND MINUTES

Edited by

**JOHN S. ROMANIDES
PAUL VERGHESE
NICK A. NISSIOTIS**

THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME X, NUMBER 2 **WINTER, 1964-1965**

Copyright 1965 by
The Greek Archdiocese Holy Cross Orthodox Theological School, Inc.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 65-21389

Published by the Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Theological School Press
50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146, U.S.A.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOL. X

WINTER, 1964-1965

NUMBER 2

CONTENTS

Preface

THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN S. ROMANIDES 7-8

Introduction

THE REV. PAUL VERGHESE AND
PROFESSOR NICK A. NISSIOTIS 9-11

List of Participants in the Consultation 12-13

An Agreed Statement 14-15

Chalcedonians and Monophysites After Chalcedon
THE REV. PROFESSOR J. MEYENDORFF 16-30

Discussion: Concerning the Paper of Father Meyendorff 30-36

One Incarnate Nature of God the Word
THE REV. PROFESSOR V. C. SAMUEL 37-51

Discussion: Concerning the Paper of Father Samuel 52-53

The Reciprocal Relation Between Doctrinal and Historical Factors in the Separation of the Oriental Churches From the Ancient Catholic Church
PROFESSOR G. KONIDARIS 54-60

Discussion: Concerning the Paper of Professor Konidaris 60

The Problem of the Unification of the Non-Chalcedonian Churches of the East with the Orthodox on the Basis of Cyril's Formula: "*Mia Physis tou Theou Logou Sesarkomene*"
PROFESSOR JOHANNES N. KARMIRIS 61-74

Discussion: Concerning the Paper of Professor Karmiris 75-81

St. Cyril's "One Physis or Hypostasis of God the Logos Incarnate" and Chalcedon	
THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN S. ROMANIDES	82–102
Discussion: Concerning the Paper of Father Romanides	102–107
The Doctrine of the Person of Christ in the Armenian Church: A brief survey with special reference to the union of the two natures	
BISHOP KAREKIN SARKISSIAN	108–119
Discussion: Concerning the Paper of Bishop Sarkissian	120–121
The Lesson of History on the Controversy Concerning the Nature of Christ	
ARCHBISHOP TIRAN NERSOYAN	122–131
Discussion: Concerning the Paper of Archbishop Tiran	131–132
The Question of Reconciliation and Reunion Between the Ancient Oriental and the Orthodox Churches	
THE REV. PROFESSOR VITALY BOROVY	133–136
A Theological Approach to the Mia-Physis Christology in the Fifth Century	
DR. K. N. KHELLA	137–144
Discussion: Concerning the Papers of Father Borovoy and Dr. Khella	144–145
Statement Made by His Grace Mar Thoma Dionysius ..	146–149
The Agreed Statement	150
Appendix	
The Doctrine of the Union of the Two Natures in Christ	
ARCHBISHOP MAR SEVERIUS ZAKKA IWAS OF MOSUL	151–153
The Mystery of the Incarnation	
THE VERY REV. LIKE SULTANAT HABTE MARIAM WORQUINEH	154–160
Index to Volume VI–X	161–168

INDEX FOR VOLUMES VI-X

KEY: A=Article
R=Book Review
BN=Book Note

NOTE: In index reference Roman numeral refers to volume number, first Arabic numeral to issue number, second Arabic numeral to page numbers.

ARTICLES

Agourides, Savas C., "The Origin of the Epistle of St. James," IX. 1, 67-68.
Agourides, Savas C., "The Social Character of Orthodoxy," VIII. 1 & 2, 7-20.
Anonymous, "The Acts of the Neomartyrs: I. St. George the Serb (1515)," VI. 2, 227-246.
Anonymous, "The Acts of the Neomartyrs: II. St. Iakovos the Righteous, St. Iakovos Deacon, Dionysios Monk; and III. St. Jordan," VII. 1 & 2, 106-117.
Anton, John P., "Plato's Philosophical Use of Myth," IX. 2, 161-180.
Bonis, Constantine, "The Heresies Combatted in Amphilochios' 'Regarding False Asceticism,'" IX. 1, 79-96.
Borovy, Rev. Vitaly, "The Question of Reconciliation and Reunion between the Ancient Oriental and Orthodox Churches," X. 2, 133-136.
Charanis, Peter, "Some Aspects of Daily Life in Byzantium," VIII. 1 & 2, 53-70.
Constantelos, Rev. Demetrios J., "Justinian and the Three Chapters of Controversy," VIII. 1, & 2, 71-94.
Constantelos, Rev. Demetrios J., "Philanthropy in the Age of Justinian," VI. 2, 206-226.
Cotsonis, Very Rev. Jerome I., "Freedom and Coercion in the Propagation of the Faith," IX. 1, 97-112.
Demos, Raphael, "Some Comparisons between Greek and Christian Ideas of Virtue," IX. 2, 153-160.
Downey, Glanville, "From the Pagan City to the Christian City," X. 1, 121-139.
Florovsky, Very Rev. Georges, "The Function of Tradition in the Ancient Church," IX. 2, 181-200.
Harakas, Rev. Stanley S., "The Natural Law Teaching of the Eastern Orthodox Church," IX. 2, 215-224.
Harakas, Rev. Stanley S., "Sergius Bulgakov and His Teaching," VII. 1 & 2, 92-105.
Ioannides, B., "The Unity of the Church According to St. Paul," IX. 1, 47-66.
Istavridis, Vasil T., "The Concept of the Nature of Men and Women Which Allows Us to Envisage Partnership," VII. 1 & 2, 14-21.
Istavridis, Vasil T., "The Ecumenical Patriarchate and the World Council of Churches," IX. 1, 9-28.
Karmiris, John, "The Ecclesiology of the Three Hierarchs," VI. 2, 135-185.
Karmiris, John, "The Problem of the Unification of the Non-Chalcedonian Churches of the East with the Orthodox on the Basis of Cyril's Formula: 'Mia Physis tou Theou Logou Sesarkomene,'" X. 2, 61-74.
Khella, K. N., "A Theological Approach to the Mia Physis Christology in the Fifth Century," X. 2, 137-144.
Konidaris, G., "Concerning the Question of the Reciprocal Relation between Doctrinal and Historical Factors in the Separation of the Oriental Churches from the Ancient Catholic Church—The Historical Background of the Separation of the Oriental Churches," X. 2, 54-60.

Kustas, George L., "History and Theology in Photius," X. 1, 37-74.

Kustas, George L., "Photian Methods in Philology," VII. 1 & 2, 78-91.

Magoulias, Rev. Harry J., "The Mysteria and Byzantine Mentality in the Sixth and Seventh Century," VIII. 1 & 2, 95-110.

Magoulias, Rev. Harry J., "A Study in Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox Church Relations on the Island of Cyprus between the Years A.D. 1196 and 1360," X. 1, 75-106.

Malik, Charles, "Beyond East and West," VII. 1 & 2, 7-13.

Mar Severius Zakka Iwas of Mosul, Archbishop, "The Doctrine of the Union of the Two Natures in Christ — A Theological View," X. 2, 151-153.

Mar Thoma Dionysius, Metropolitan, "A Statement," X. 2, 146-149.

Meyendorff, Rev. J., "Chalcedonians and Monophysites after Chalcedon," X. 2, 16-30.

Nersoyan, Most Rev. Tiran, "The Lesson of History on the Controversy Concerning the Nature of Christ," X. 2, 122-131.

Nissiotis, N. A., "The Ecclesiological Foundation of Mission from the Orthodox Point of View," VII. 1 & 2, 22-52.

Nissiotis, Nikos A., "Ecclesiology and Ecumenism of the Second Session of the Vatican Council II," X. 1, 15-36.

Panichas, George A., "J. D. Salinger and the Russian Pilgrim," VIII. 1 & 2, 111-126.

Philippidis, Leonidas J., "Prayer from a Religious and Psychological Point of View," IX. 1, 29-46.

Psomiades, Harry J., "The Oecumenical Patriarchate Under the Turkish Republic: The First Ten Years," VI. 1, 56-80.

Rodopoulos, Very Rev. P., "Doctrinal Teaching in the *Sacramentary* of Serapion of Thmuis," IX. 2, 201-214.

Romanides, Rev. John S., "An Orthodox Look at the Ecumenical Movement," X. 1, 7-14.

Romanides, Rev. John S., "The Ecclesiology of St. Ignatius of Antioch," VII. 1 & 2, 53-77.

Romanides, Rev. John S., "Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics," VI. 2, 186-205.

Romanides, Rev. John S., "Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics — II," IX. 2, 225-270.

Romanides, Rev. John S., "Remarks of an Orthodox Christian on Religious Freedom," VIII. 1 & 2, 127-132.

Romanides, Rev. John S., "St. Cyril's 'One Physis or Hypostasis of God the Logos Incarnate' and Chalcedon," X. 2, 81-102.

Samuel, Rev. V. C., "One Incarnate Nature of God the Word," X. 2, 37-51.

Sarkessian, Rt. Rev. K. V., "The Doctrine of the Person of Christ in the Armenian Church — A Brief Survey with Special Reference to the Union of the Two Natures," X. 2, 108-119.

Siotes, Mark, "Constantine Oikonomos of the House of Oikonomos and the Operations of the British Bible Society in Greece (1780-1857)," VI. 1, 7-55.

Smith, Morton, "The Religious Conflict in Central Europe," VIII. 1 & 2, 21-52.

Vellas, Vasilios M., "The Spiritual Man According to the Old Testament Prophets," X. 1, 107-120.

Worquineh, Very Rev. Like Siltanat Habte Mariam, "The Mystery of the Incarnation," X. 2, 154-160.

BOOK REVIEWS

Adelson, Howard L., *Light Weight Solidi and Byzantine Trade During the Sixth and Seventh Centuries*, (Kustas), VII. 1, 137-139.

Allchin, A. M., *The Silent Rebellion: Anglican Religious Communities 1845-1900*, (Stockton), VI. 2, 94-97.

Ankori, Zvi, *Karaites in Byzantium, the Formative Years, 970-1100*, (Smith), VI. 1, 87-88.

Bamm, Peter, *Early Christian Sites*, (Gamsky), IX. 1, 132-133.

Bettenson, H., tr. & ed., *The Early Christian Fathers*, (Berry), IX. 1, 116-118.

Bihalji-Merin, Otto, *Byzantine Frescoes and Icons in Yugoslavia*, (Proussis), VII. 1 & 2, 131-132.

Boas, George, *Some Assumptions of Aristotle*, (Anton), VII. 1 & 2, 136-137.

Bodnar, E. W., S.J., *Cyriacus of Ancona and Athens*, (Proussis), VII. 1 & 2, 133-134.

Bonnard, André, *Greek Civilization from Euripides to Alexandria*, (Proussis), VII. 1 & 2, 134-136.

Cannon, William Ragsdale, *History of Christianity in the Middle Ages: From the Fall of Rome to the Fall of Constantinople*, (Counelis), VI. 2, 251-253.

Doerries, Herman, *Constantine and Religious Liberty*, (Archon), VIII. 1 & 2, 142-3.

Emmanuel, Philip D., Emmanuel, Artemis P., and Pappageotis, George C., eds., *Modern Greek Literary Gems*, (Proussis), VIII. 1 & 2, 150-151.

Emmanuel, Artemis P., same, above.

Finley, M. I., ed., *The Greek Historians*, (Humphrey), IX. 1, 128-130.

French, R. M., tr., *The Way of a Pilgrim and the Pilgrim Continues His Way*, (Papademetriou), X. 1, 157-158.

Geanakoplos, Deno J., *Greek Scholars In Venice*, (Proussis), VIII, 1 & 2, 143-146.

Giardoglou, N. and Korakides, A., ed., *Selected Sermons of the Fathers of the Church*, (Bebis), VI. 2, 250-251.

Gill, D., *The Council of Florence*, (Constantelos), VIII. 1 & 2, 151-156.

Golding, Louis, *Goodbye Ithaca*, (Rexine), IX. 1, 137-139.

Gordon, Cyrus H., *Before the Bible* (Proussis), IX. 2, 302-308.

Grant, Michael, *The World of Rome*, (McGarity), IX. 2, 289-293.

Guthrie, W. K. C., *In the Beginning: Some Greek Views on the Origins of Life and the Early State of Man*, (Proussis), VI. 1, 85-87.

Hadas, Moses, *Old Wine New Bottles*, (Demetrius), X. 1, 153-155.

Harbison, E. Harris, *The Christian Scholar in the Age of Reformation*, (Constantelos), VII. 1 & 2, 156-161.

Hope, Richard, *Aristotle's Physics*, (Anton), IX. 1, 119-120.

Hudson, D. F., *Teach Yourself New Testament Greek*, (Proussis), VI. 1, 99-102.

Jay, Eric G., *New Testament Greek: An Introductory Grammar*, (Proussis), VII. 1 & 2, 132-133.

Jones, A. H. M., *Athenian Democracy*, (Toumbakis), VII. 1 & 2, 143-146.

Jones, A. H. M., *Studies in Roman Government and Law*, (Humphrey), X. 1, 155-157.

Kalogerou, John O., *Mary the Virgin Mother of God According to the Orthodox Faith*, (Bebis), VI. 1, 88-92.

Kelemen, Pál, *El Greco Revisited*, (Proussis), VIII. 1 & 2, 149-150.

Kepler, Thomas S., *The Book of Revelation*, (Constantelos), IX. 1, 113-114.

Kiliç, Altemur, *Turkey in the World*, (Psomiades), VI. 1, 81-83.

Kontoglou, Ph., *Ekphrasis of Orthodox Iconography*, (Proussis), VII, 1 & 2, 125-127.

Korakides, A. and Giardoglou, N., ed., *Selected Sermons of the Fathers of the Church*, (Bebis), VI. 2, 250-251.

Lampe, G. W. H., ed., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, (Proussis), VII. 1 & 2, 122-125.

Leon, Harry J., *The Jews of Ancient Rome*, (Rexine), VII. 1 & 2, 118-122.

Lossky, Vladimir, *The Vision of God*, (Slayton), X. 1, 144-148.

Maas, Paul, and Trypanis, C. A., *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica*, (Proussis), IX. 2, 308-311.

MacKendrick, Paul M., and Scramuzza, Vincent M., *The Ancient World*, (Humphrey), IX. 1, 125-127.

McLoughlin, Emmett, *American Culture and Catholic Schools*, (Rexine), VI. 2, 247-249.

Manrique, L., *The Spaniard in Greece*, (Demetrius), VIII. 1 & 2, 162-164.

Marinatos, Spyridon, *Crete and Mycenaean Greece*, (Proussis), VI. 1, 83-85.

Marson, P., *A Teacher Speaks*, (Kazamias), VII. 1 & 2, 146-149.

Maus, Cynthia P., *The Church and the Fine Arts*, (Rexine), VIII. 1 & 2, 156-158.

Neill, Stephen C., and Rouse, Ruth (edd.), *A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1948*, (Istavridis), IX. 2, 271-285.

Nettleship, Richard Lewis, *Lectures on the Republic of Plato*, (Morris), X. 1, 150-152.

Nilsson, Martin P., *Greek Folk Religion*, (Rexine), VI. 2, 249-250.

Pappageotes, George C., Emmanuel, Philip D., Emmanuel, Artemis P., eds., *Modern Greek Literary Gems*, (Proussis), VIII. 1 & 2, 150-151.

Payne, R., *The Splendor of Greece*, (Demetrius), VII. 1 & 2, 149-155.

Pelican, Jaroslav, *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism*, (Harakas), VI. 1, 97-99.

Rand, Christopher, *Grecian Calendar*, (Demetrius), VIII. 1 & 2, 158-161.

Randall, John H., Jr., *Aristotle*, (Morris), VIII. 1 & 2, 139-141.

Rice, Eugene F., Jr., *The Renaissance Idea of Wisdom*, (Constantelos), VII. 1 & 2, 139-143.

Rice, David Talbot, *The Art of Byzantium*, (Proussis), VI. 1, 92-94.

Richter, Friedrich, *Martin Luther and Ignatius Loyola*, (Constantelos), VII. 1 & 2, 161-165.

Rodocanachi, C. P., *Athens and the Greek Miracle*, (Demetrius), IX. 1, 135-136.

Romaios, K., *Near the Roots*, (Proussis), IX. 2, 311-313.

Ross, Sir David, *Aristotle, De Anima*, (Anton), IX. 1, 118-119.

Rouse, Ruth, and Neill, Stephen C. (edd.), *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, (Istavridis), IX. 2, 271-285.

Rowell, Henry Thompson, *Rome in the Augustan Age*, (Rexine), IX. 1, 130-132.

Scramuzza, Vincent M. and MacKendrick, Paul L., *The Ancient World*, (Humphrey), IX. 1, 125-127.

Sherrard, Philip, *Athos: The Mountain of Silence*, (Proussis), VII. 1 & 2, 129-131.

Smith, Homer W., *Man and His Gods*, (Demetrius), IX. 1, 122-125.

Sophocles, S. M., *A History of Greece*, (Demetrius), IX. 1, 120-122.

Sophocles, S. M., *A History of Greece*, (Tsoumas), IX. 2, 294-302.

Spence, Hartzell, *The Story of America's Religions*, (Rexine), IX. 1, 115-116.

Stockhammer, Morris, (ed.), *Plato Dictionary*, (Anton), X. 1, 148-150.

Syndicus, Eduard, *Early Christian Art*, (Proussis), VII. 1 & 2, 127-129.

Tatakis, N., *Philosophy and Science* (Proussis), VIII. 1 & 2, 146-149.

Tenney, Merrill C., *The Reality of the Resurrection*, (Slayton), X. 1, 141-144.

Trypanis, C. A., and Maas, Paul, *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica*, (Proussis), IX. 2, 308-311.

Warmington, B. H., *Carthage*, (Demetrius), VIII. 1 & 2, 133-139.

Williams, George H., *The Radical Reformation*, (Bebis), IX. 2, 285-289.
 Zernov, Nicholas, *Eastern Christendom*, (Rexine), IX. 1, 133-135.
 Ziogas, Elias C., *The Argonaut: An Annual Review of American-Hellenic Life and Thought*, Vol. II, (Froussis), IX. 2, 313-314.

BOOK NOTES

Attwater, Donald, *A List of Books in English About the Eastern Churches*, (Rexine), IX. 2, 317.
 Bainton, Roland H., *Early Christianity*, (Rexine), VII. 1 & 2, 168-169.
 Benz, Ernst, *The Eastern Orthodox Church: Its Thought and Life*, (Rexine), IX. 2, 318-319.
 Bergson, Henri, *The Philosophy of Poetry: The Genius of Lucretius*, (Rexine), VIII. 1 & 2, 176.
 Bourmis, Archimandrite Theodoritos, *The Unbewn Grotto of the Apocalypse*, (Rexine), IX. 1, 142.
 Bratton, Fred Gladstone, *A History of the Bible*, (Rexine), IX. 1, 143.
 Cabasilas, Nicholas, *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy*, (Rexine), VII. 1 & 2, 169-170.
 Carcopino, Jerome, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, (Constantelos), VI. 1, 121-123.
 Carstensen, Roger N., *Job: Defense of Honor: An Exposition of the Inner Experience of Man*, (Rexine), IX. 2, 317-318.
 Chatzidakis, Manolis, and Grabar André, *Greece: Byzantine Mosaics*, (Rexine), VI. 1, 107-108.
Chrysostom and His Message, tr. by Stephen Neill, (Rexine), IX. 2, 319.
 Constantelos, Rev. Demetrius J., *The Greek Orthodox Catholic Church*, (Rexine), IX. 1, 140-141.
 Crossman, R. H. S., M.P., *Plato Today*, rev. ed., (Rexine), VI. 1, 104-106.
 Douglas, J. D., ed., *The New Bible Dictionary*, (Rexine), VIII. 1 & 2, 165.
 Ewing, Upton Clary, *The Prophet of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, (Rexine), IX. 2, 320.
 Ferguson, George, *Signs and Symbols in Christian Art*, (Rexine), IX. 2, 319-320.
 Ferm, Vergilius, ed., *An Encyclopedia of Religion*, (Rexine), VIII. 1 & 2, 165-166.
 Festugiere, André-Jean, O.P., *Personal Religion Among the Greeks*, (Rexine), VIII. 1 & 2, 175.
 Fortes, Meyer, *Oedipus and Job in West African Religion*, (Rexine), VI. 1, 116-117.
 Gordon, Cyrus H., *New Horizons in Old Testament Literature*, (Proussis), VI. 1, 114-115.
 Grabar, André, *Byzantine Painting: Historical and Critical Study*, (Rexine), VII. 1 & 2, 171.
 Grabar, André, Chatzidakis, Manolis, *Greece: Byzantine Mosaics*, (Rexine), VI. 1, 107-108.
 Gregory, Horace and Zatutrenksa, Marya, eds., *The Mentor Book of Religious Verse*, (Demetrius), VII. 1 & 2, 167-168.
 Gregerson, Jon, *The Transfigured Cosmos*, (Harakas), VII. 1 & 2, 166.
 Guthrie, W. K. C., *The Greek Philosophers from Thales to Aristotle*, (Greene), VI. 1, 103-104.
 Hadas, Moses, *Hellenistic Culture: Fusion and Diffusion*, (Rexine), VI. 1, 111-112.
 Hadas, Moses, *A History of Greek Literature*, (Rexine), VIII. 1 & 2, 168.
 Hammond, N. G. L., *A History of Greece to 322 B.C.*, (Murray), VI. 1, 115-116.

Hatzopoulos, Rev. Harry P., *Prayer Book and Hymnology of the Holy Eastern Orthodox Church Rendered in Greek, English and English Phonetics*, (Rexine), VIII. 1 & 2, 172-174.

Horgan, Paul, *Rome Eternal*, (Rexine), IX. 1, 142-143.

Hus, Alain, *Greek and Roman Religion*, (Rexine), VIII. 1 & 2, 166-167.

Huxley, G. L., *Anthemius of Tralles: A Study in Later Greek Geometry*, (Soulis), VI. 1, 118-119.

Jaeger, Werner, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*, (Rexine), VIII. 1 & 2, 172.

Kerenyi, C., *Asklepios: Archetypal Image of the Physician's Existence*, (Rexine), VII. 1 & 2, 174-175.

Kerenyi, C., *The Gods of the Greeks*, (Rexine), VI. 1, 109-110.

Kiernan, Thomas P., ed., *Aristotle Dictionary*, (Rexine), VIII, 1 & 2, 171-172.

Koyre, Alexandre, *Discovering Plato*, (Rexine), VIII. 1 & 2, 170-171.

Kühner, Hans, *Encyclopedia of the Papacy*, (Rexine), VII. 1 & 2, 170-171.

Langnos, I. A., and List, Jacob Samuel, *Concise Dictionary of Literature*, (Rexine), IX. 2, 315.

List, etc. Same as above.

McGuire, Martin R. P., *Introduction to Classical Scholarship: A Syllabus and Bibliographical Guide*, (Rexine), IX. 1, 140.

McKenna, Marian, *Pictorial History of Catholicism*, (Rexine), VIII. 1 & 2, 174-175.

Malik, Charles, *Christ and Crisis*, (Rexine), IX. 1, 144.

Mantiband, James H., *A Concise Dictionary of Greek Literature*, (Rexine), VIII. 1 & 2, 169.

Molland, Einar, *Christendom: The Christian Churches Throughout the World*, (Rexine), VII. 1 & 2, 172-173.

Moraites, Demetrios N., *The Earliest Known Form of the Liturgies of St. Basil the Great and St. John Chrysostom*, (Bebis), VI. 1, 119-120.

Nock, A. D., *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo*, (Rexine), IX. 2, 316.

Parkes, Henry Bamford, *Gods and Men: The Origins of Western Culture*, (Archon), VI. 1, 120-121.

Pearson, Lionel, *Popular Ethics in Ancient Greece*, (Rexine), VIII. 1 & 2, 169-170.

Petrie, A., *An Introduction to Greek History, Antiquities and Literature*, (Rexine), IX. 2, 315.

Plato, *Gorgias*, tr. W. Hamilton, (Rexine), VI. 1, 109.

Prosepheterion (Treasury of Prayers), (Harakas), VII. 1 & 2, 167.

Rabinowitz, W. Gerson, *Aristotle's Protrepticus and the Sources of the Reconstruction*, (Rexine), VI. 1, 110-111.

Rice, David Talbot, *Masterpieces of Byzantine Art*, (Rexine), VI. 1, 108.

Robinson, Charles Alexander, Jr., *Athens in the Age of Pericles*, (Rexine), VI. 1, 106-107.

Runes, Dagobert D., *Concise Dictionary of Judaism*, (Rexine), VI. 1, 118.

Dictionary of Philosophy, (Rexine), VIII. 1 & 2, 166.

Pictorial History of Philosophy, (Rexine), VI. 1, 117-118.

Sauvage, Micheline, *Socrates and the Human Conscience*, (Rexine), VIII, 1 & 2, 170.

Scullard, H. H., and Van der Heyden, A. A. M., eds., *Atlas of the Classical World*, (Proussis), VI. 1, 112-113.

Seltman, Charles, *The Twelve Olympians*, (Rexine), VII. 1 & 2, 175-176.

Shepherd, Massey Hamilton Jr., ed., *The Eucharist and Liturgical Renewal*, (Rexine), X. 1, 159-160.

Speaight, Robert, *Christian Theatre*, (Proussis), VI. 1, 113-114.

Swihart, Altman K., *Luther and the Lutheran Church 1483-1960*, (Rexine), VII. 1 & 2, 173-174.

Taylor, A. E., *The Mind of Plato*, (Rexine), VIII, 1 & 2, 171.

Theodoracopoulos, J. N., *Plato, Plotinus, Origenes*, (Proussis), VI. 1, 104.

Umen, Samuel, *The Nature of Judaism*, (Rexine), VII. 1 & 2, 176.

Van der Heyden, A. A. M., and Scullard, H. H., eds., *Atlas of the Classical World*, (Proussis), VI. 1, 112-113 .

Ware, Timothy, *The Orthodox Church*, (Rexine), IX. 1, 143-144.

Wild, Doris, *Holy Icons in the Religious Art of the Eastern Church*, (Rexine), IX. 1, 141-142.

Winn, Ralph B., *A Concise Dictionary of Existentialism*, (Rexine), VII. 1 & 2, 175.

Zaturenska, Marya, and Gregory, Horace, eds., *The Mentor Book of Religious Verse*, (Demetrios), VII. 1 & 2, 167-168.

CONTRIBUTORS

Agourides, Savas C. A VIII. 1 & 2, 7-20; IX. 1, 67-68.

Anton, John P. R VII. 1 & 2, 136-137; IX. 1, 119-120; A IX. 2, 161-180; R X. 1, 148-150.

Archon, Dion J. J. BN VI 1, 120-121; R VIII. 1 & 2, 142-143.

Bebis, Rev. Constantine S. R IX. 2, 285-289.

Bebis, George S. BN VI. 1, 119-120; R VI. 2, 250-251.

Berry, Donald L. R IX. 1, 116-118.

Bonis, Constantine A IX. 1, 79-96.

Borovoy, Rev. Vitaly A X. 2, 133-136.

Charanis, Peter A VIII. 1 & 2, 53-70.

Constantelos, R ev. Demetrios J. BN VI. 1, 121-123; A VI. 2, 206-226; R VII. 1 & 2, 139-143, 156-161, 161-165; A VIII. 1 & 2, 71-94; R IX. 1, 113-114.

Cotsonis, Very Rev. Jerome I. A IX. 1, 97-112.

Counelis, James Steven R VI. 2, 251-253.

Demetrios, James Kleon R VII. 1 & 2, 149-155; BN VII. 1 & 2, 167-168; VIII. 1 & 2, 133-139, 158-161, 162-164; IX. 1, 120-122, 122-125, 135-136; X. 1, 153-155.

Demos, Raphael A IX. 2, 153-160.

Downey, Glanville A X. 1, 121-139.

Florovsky, Very Rev. Georges A IX. 2, 181-200.

Gamsky, Irene Simos R IX. 1, 132-133.

Greene, William C. BN VI. 1, 103-104.

Harakas, Rev. Stanley S. R VI. 1, 97-99; A VII. 1 & 2, 92-105; BN VII. 1 & 2, 166, 167; IX. 2, 215-224.

Humphrey, Michael H. R IX. 1, 125-127, 128-130; X. 1, 155-157.

Ioannides, B. A IX. 1, 47-66.

Istavrides, Vasil T. A VII. 1 & 2, 14-21; IX. 1, 9-28; R IX. 2, 271-285.

Karmiris, John A VI. 2, 135-185; X. 2, 61-74.

Kazamias, Andreas M. R VII. 1 & 2, 146-149.

Khella, K. N. A X. 2, 137-144.

Konidaris, G. A X. 2, 54-60.

Kustas, George L. A VII. 1 & 2, 78-91; R VII. 1 & 2, 137-139; A X. 1, 37-74 .

McCarthy, Frederick W. R IX. 2, 289-293.

Magoulias, Rev. Harry J. A VIII. 1 & 2, 95-110; X. 1, 75-106.

Malik, Charles A VII. 1 & 2, 7-13.

Mar Severius Zakka Iwas of Mosul, Archbishop, A X. 2 , 151-153.

Mar Thoma Dionysius, Metropolitan A X. 2, 146-149.

Meyendorff, Rev. J. A X. 2, 16-30.

Morris, John S. R VIII. 1 & 2, 139-141; X. 1, 150-152.

Murray, Robert L. Jr. BN VI. 1, 115-116.

Nersoyan, Most Rev. Tiran A X. 2, 122-131.

Nissiotis, Nikos A. A VII. 1 & 2, 22-52; X. 1, 15-36.

INDEX FOR VOLUMES VI-X

Panichas, George A. A VIII. 1 & 2, 111-126.

Papademetriou, Presv. Athanasia R X. 1, 157-158.

Philippides, Leonidas J. A IX. 1, 29-46.

Proussis, Costas M. R VI. 1, 83-85, 85-87, 92-94, 99-102; BN 104, 112-113, 113-114, 114-115; R VII. 1 & 2, 122-125, 125-127, 127-129, 129-131, 131-132, 132-133, 133-134, 134-136; VIII. 1 & 2, 143-146, 146-149, 149-150, 150-151; IX. 2, 302-308, 308-311, 311-313, 313-314.

Psomiades, Harry J. A VI. 1, 56-80; R VI. 1, 81-83.

Rexine, John E. BN VI. 1, 104-106, 106-107, 107-108, 108-109, 109-110, 110-111, 111-112, 116-117, 117-118, 118; R VI. 2, 247-249, 249-250; VII. 1 & 2, 118-122; BN VII. 1 & 2, 168-176; R VIII. 1 & 2, 156-158; BN VIII. 1 & 2, 165-176; R IX. 1, 115-116, 130-132, 133-135, 137-139; BN IX. 1, 140-144; BN IX. 2, 315-320; BN X. 1, 159-160.

Rodopoulos, Very Rev. P. A IX. 2, 201-204.

Romanides, Rev. John S. A VI. 2, 186-205; VII. 1 & 2, 53-77; VIII. 1 & 2, 127-132; IX. 2, 225-270; X. 1, 7-14; X. 2, 81-102.

Samuel, Rev. V. C. A X. 2, 37-51.

Sarkissian, Rt. Rev. K. V. A X. 2, 108-119.

Siotes, Mark A VI. 1, 7-55.

Slayton, Mary R X. 1, 141-144, 144-148.

Smith, Morton R VI. 1, 87-88; A VIII. 1 & 2, 21-52.

Soulis, George C. BN VI. 1, 118-119.

Stockton, Richard R VI. 1, 94-97.

Toumbakis, Daniel C. R VII. 1 & 2, 143-146.

Tsoumas, Rev. George S. R IX. 2, 294-302.

Vellas, Vasilios M. A X. 1, 107-120.

Worquineh, Very Rev. Like Siltanat Habte Mariam A X. 2, 154-160.

EASTERN ORTHODOX AND ORIENTAL ORTHODOX CHURCHES

In history textbooks the Oriental Orthodox are called Monophysites, a title which they themselves disown. They number approximately 30 million and are to be found in such countries as Egypt, the Sudan, Ethiopia, Turkey, Soviet Armenia, Syria, Palestine, Jordan, Iraq, and India. There are also substantial numbers in Europe and America. Their rejection of the Fourth Ecumenical Council in 451 resulted in the first major division within Christendom.

The Eastern Orthodox number approximately 200 million and are to be found in such countries as Turkey, Egypt, Syria, Palestine, Russia, Cyprus, Greece, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania, Poland, Finland, Czechoslovakia, several countries of Africa and Western Europe, and with substantial numbers in China, Japan, Australia, and the American Continent where there are some 6 million.

The papers and minutes published in this volume represent an unofficial attempt on the part of theologians of both sides to evaluate the nature of the 5th century division and the efforts at reunion and to explore possibilities for the future.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

August 14th, 1964, Morning Session.

A THEOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE MIA-PHYSIS CHRISTOLOGY IN THE FIFTH CENTURY

By DR. K. N. KHELLA

Cyril was the last church father whose teaching was accepted by the whole Christian Church. The controversy which began after his death had to do with the way in which his doctrine was to be interpreted. The opponents of Cyril's theology also participated in the controversy. They, however, did not openly express their criticism in order not to lay themselves open to the suspicion that they were disturbing the peace of the Church. That led to the unusual situation that differing Christologies and contradictory doctrines all tried to take their bearings from Cyril. Dioscoros, Cyril's successor, made it his prime task to preserve Cyril's heritage and to defend it against all attacks. So one may consider his pontificate as the continuation of Cyril's influence. There was only one possibility if the peace of the Church was to be maintained: to help to victory the tradition which Cyril has also defended "without adding anything to it or subtracting anything from it." This stance soon brought him into conflict with his colleagues in Antioch, Constantinople and Rome, although the apostolic bishops also characterized themselves as representatives of Cyril's Christology or at least claimed that their teaching was not contradictory to his. When Dioscoros, in the year 449, received the Emperor's commission to hold an imperial synod in Ephesus under his chairmanship, he used this opportunity to renew the victory of the tradition over all "heretical" (i.e. revisionist) attacks. In this way Cyril, in the person of Dioscoros, triumphed again. In connection with Ephesus II, Dioscoros received from the Emperor the formal right to depose all opponents of the doctrine of the great councils (325 and 431). He exercised this right even against the Roman Bishop. Then, however, took place the change in the historical situation following the death of the Emperor Theodosius II in the year 450. With the change of sovereign, Byzantium began a new religious policy. The first political act of the new ruling pair was the convocation of a new council, in the hope of furthering the unity of the Christian Roman Empire on a new basis and of ensuring the permanence

of Byzantine domination. But the synod, which was to have demonstrated the unity in both Church and Empire, led to division in both. Dioscoros was deposed on 13th October 451 in Chalcedon and banished to Gangra, where he spent the rest of his life.

THE TWO THEOLOGICAL TRENDS OF THE TIME: THE TRADITIONALISTS AND THE REVISIONISTS

At the centre of all that has been handed down to us of the theology of the fifth century stands the problem of the time, the problem of Christology. In this situation Dioscoros (and other information apart from his own confirms this) is seen to be marked by his adherence to the tradition of the fathers "without adding anything to it or subtracting anything from it." He is represented as the one who championed the unadulterated doctrine of the great councils and defended the "one nature of the incarnate Logos" in which the humanity and the divinity of Christ were united without separation or confusion. Since the tendency is to prove the agreement of Dioscoros with the tradition, his views are constantly supported by the words of Scripture, the councils and the fathers. On the other hand, our sources provide us also with a more exact statement of the systematic development of this theology and of his exegesis. From what has been said, it is clear that at this point also he adhered to the tradition of his predecessors in the See of Alexandria.

The definition of the Church's doctrine by the Councils of Nicea and Ephesus decisively determined the relation of the Church to its theological tradition. It was possible to indicate exactly the "orthodoxy" of a doctrine or a group. Whoever acknowledged both councils, and with them the faith of the fathers, was orthodox. Orthodoxy consisted, therefore, in adhering to the ecumenical decisions "without adding anything to it or subtracting anything from it." While, however, all claimed to adhere to the faith of the fathers, there were individual groups which — contrary to their claim — sought to introduce innovations, at least in the field of interpretation. These innovations consisted, according to the orthodox, in the abrogation of important statements of faith. The "conservatives" saw clearly that the "innovators," although they claimed to adhere to the faith and credal formulae of the fathers, obliterated the distinctions made in face of heresy. Therefore any reference to the "two natures" was inevitably

odious to the orthodox (= traditionalists), because it was apt to veil the opposition between the orthodox doctrine and Nestorianism.

This struggle of the parties in the middle of the fifth century therefore has not only to do with the understanding of the union of the two natures of the person of Christ. The conflict is rather to be seen in its wider context, namely in the relation of the Church to its tradition. The Church is instituted by God to be the guardian of the revealed faith and commissioned to interpret it; therefore there must necessarily always be traditionalists and modernists in the Church. With these presuppositions, Dioscoros could only see himself as the guardian of the Church's tradition. Likewise, Leo was bound to appear to him as the leader of the innovators. For the traditionalists of course, a renewal of doctrine or definition meant also a deviation; such a renewal brought the danger of heresy onto the scene, even if no one wanted to make this accusation explicitly. Therefore the controversy about the doctrine of the two natures is basically a controversy about the problem, whether one may undertake a new formulation of dogma. For Dioscoros and his followers this was not permissible. They wished to hold to the Nicenum and the Ephesenum. That they had to refer to "two" councils, was a blemish in their argument. "Two councils in name," Dioscoros used to say, "but one in faith." Naturally, his opponents also claimed to represent the faith of the fathers. While he tried to decide the new dispute about the natures of Christ on the basis of the statements of the existing confessions and refused to admit a new definition, the revisionists had to prove that the old confessions were insufficient and that their own statements also were grounded in the statements of the fathers.

One must be clear about the fact that this did not have to do with individuals, but with ecclesiastical parties. More precisely, there was a very wide range of views in each party, and there were extremists on both sides. There were, to boot, heretical groups which stood outside both parties, but which tried to attach themselves, with their views, to one party or the other. Accordingly they used the current terminology, made use of the arguments which were employed by the two parties in the conflict, and sided with the theses of the party which stood nearer to them at the time. This can be shown, for example, in the dispute between Eutyches and Flavian at the *Synodos Endemousa* of 448.

Eutyches declared that he had never before heard or learned such a thing, but was prepared to submit to the judgment of the bishops present. Flavian, who could not ignore the offensiveness, reacted very sensitively: "It is not we who are introducing innovations, but this is the way our fathers put the matter." The point is to be seen also in the manner in which the monks reacted to the condemnation of Dioscoros at the meeting of 13th October in Chalcedon. By condemning Dioscoros, the embodiment of the Church's tradition, the synod was thought to have annulled the Nicenum and the Ephesenum. By deposing the Bishop of Alexandria, the members of the synod had set themselves in contradiction to the doctrines of the great councils.

The ensuing dispute between Carosos and the synod shows still more clearly the claim of both parties to adhere to the Church's tradition. The Archimandrite declared: "I persist in the faith of the 318 fathers of Nicea in which I was baptized, and in the definition of the fathers who deposed Nestorius at Ephesus; that is my belief, and of another faith I know nothing." The opposition party could not object to this argument, for the faith of the fathers was the incontrovertible basis of orthodox thinking and teaching. By confessing the faith of the fathers, Carosos forced his opponents to defend themselves. He was therefore immediately given the answer, that no one at the Synod of Chalcedon was thinking of tampering with Nicea or Ephesus. But the new points of dispute which had been raised had forced Leo, as once Cyril, to interpret the Symbol of Nicea; but no one had allowed himself an expansion of the faith and of the dogma.

This adherence to the Church's tradition is the decisive characteristic of the views of Dioscoros. As the Bishop of Alexandria, having his views stamped with the spirit of the Alexandrian school, the doctrine of the fathers formed the very heart of his faith. For Dioscoros, orthodoxy meant the unaltered continuing existence of the Church's tradition. It was to preserve this existence that he had been installed in his office. He appealed to the fact, "that the bishops of Alexandria had never abandoned the right faith." And at another place he says: "Look, here is the orthodox faith of Nicea . . . here are the Twelve Chapters of St. Cyril and of the others, which Dioscoros brought in this land . . . see, I go to my God with this faith in my hands and bring it back to him as a gift."

In saying all this, we have named the reason why Dioscoros

could not have been the inventor of a Christology of his own; if he had wanted this, he would have had to contradict his own theological conviction. Rather the theological principle of the perfection of the Symbol can be traced back to him. He proclaimed that the Church's doctrine is complete. Even if up to this point God has been revealing himself, dogma is now lacking in nothing which is necessary for our understanding. Our task now is only to preserve what we received by tradition, without adding anything to it or subtracting anything from it. That has never been said before with such decisiveness. Dioscoros is the teacher of a new epoch, one whose historical consciousness is determined by the cessation of the revelation of dogma. That is a peculiarly modern Christian turn in the idea of completeness. No other father expressed, as he did, the view that the Church's doctrine was given by God, through the Holy Spirit, via the apostles, councils and fathers as far as Cyril; the Church's tradition has become a fixed and completely closed entity.

As we said above, Dioscoros could not have been, nor wished to be, the inventor of a theology. The progress marked by his views consists in the fact that he proclaimed the cessation of the formulation of dogmas. This is shown precisely in his Christology; even this is no new creation, but tradition. It is wholly a repetition of the witness of the fathers, primarily (of course) the witness of his teacher and father St. Cyril of Alexandria. This indeed does not mean that he takes no credit for the further theological development; in particular, he gave to the terminology of Cyril a sharper and clearer formulation. All the same, he remains wholly within the bounds given to him; the views of the fathers are normative with respect to what they say and what they do not say. When Dioscoros takes up a position with regard to the heresies and doctrines of his time, he proves his own opinion, wherever possible, by quotations or by showing that certain points are not in accord with the teaching of the fathers; for the teaching of the fathers is truth. In this point there is an unmistakable difference between Dioscoros on the one hand and Flavian and Leo on the other. These last also were keen to support their opinions with the views of the fathers. But their unrestricted interpretation and further development of the doctrine of the fathers was not possible for Dioscoros. His position with respect to the Chalcedon formula is the necessary result of this; for the formula of Chalcedon is more than (say) a further development

of Cyrillic Christology. For Dioscoros, by contrast, Christology does not mean speculation, but doctrine, i.e. a fact which one receives by tradition from one's teacher and passes on to one's own pupils. In the church the generations change, but not the dogma; it is the same teaching which is taken up and passed on further. One can find this principle of faithfulness in preserving and transmitting tradition down the generations in a song of the Coptic Church, probably composed by Dioscoros himself. The song is sung by the congregation after the intercession for the dead, and it emphasizes faithfulness to the doctrine in which the fathers died, in which the present generation stands, and in which all future members and generations of the church will stand:

Hosper en kai estai estin apo geneas eis genean kai pantas tous aionas ton aionon, amen.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF DIOSCOROS

It is clear that Dioscoros followed the Christology of Cyril as he found it when he entered upon his pontificate. Christ is, as universally believed, perfect God and perfect man, consubstantial with the Father and with us; in Him divinity and humanity are never mixed, confused or changed; He is one and the same person, both in His eternal pre-existence and also in the economy in which He fulfills the intentions of God and those of man.

From the beginning, Dioscoros had a different starting-point for his thinking than that of his Chalcedonian opponents. Their doctrine was bound to offend his thought and speech from the start; first, because it had to do with innovations and then, because it contradicted his soteriological conviction. He did not see what was the good of a new formulation. The terminology used by himself fulfilled the same intentions as the Chalcedonian formula was intended to serve. It was not as if the Alexandrian language did not recognize the permanent duality of the elements in the union, even if it spoke only of "one" physis. Alexandrian Christology made a thorough-going distinction between the divinity and the humanity after the incarnation and had, moreover, found apt formulations in which it could speak of this. But the negative attitude of Dioscoros was directed above all against "innovation." The synod of Chalcedon determined a change in that formula of Cyril which had been acknowledged by Ephesus; that meant for Dioscoros the removal of the old expression and the introduction of a new.

Dioscoros' view was not framed according to this own free judgment. He was forced into it, because the foundation of his basic presupposition, which becomes clear in his Christology, was that the revelation of the doctrine about Christ is to be found in tradition. Therefore he could not break loose from tradition, and he wanted above all to remain Cyrillic (until his death, Cyril was taken for the representative of orthodoxy, and he won a world-wide recognition for this). One may, therefore, never forget that the authoritative argument of tradition played the most important role with Dioscoros. He was constantly looking out for the written Biblical and patristic sources, and of these he used above all the works of St. Cyril. For him, the authority of this father was decisive at all points, and the facts show that it was not boastfulness when he taught that he followed Cyril's doctrine not by half measure but to the full. The same was true also of his successors, who are all distinguished by their rich knowledge of the fathers.

So we must say that the Christology of Dioscoros was pre-Chalcedonian and remained so. Dioscoros refused the Chalcedonian innovations in the Christological formulas; he would not accept the expression "*two natures*", first on the theological ground that there should be no innovations, and then on Christological grounds. Therefore, the reason for his refusal to acknowledge the Chalcedonian Symbol was not that he rejected the doctrine which spoke of the presence and permanence of the true divinity and the true humanity, undivided and unconfused, in Christ; for this he had himself, as a conservative, already learned and taught. Rather did the views of Dioscoros, in contrast to those of Leo, represent the natural continuation of the traditional conciliar theology.

* * *

There resulted from this, for the first time in Church history, a lasting schism, reaching into the present, between major groups within the Christian church. Even the adherents of the synod were not united in their view, so that the seed of the second schism between East and West in 1054 was already sown at Chalcedon. In the ensuing history, the fateful consequences of this ecumenical error are seen, not only in that this was a preparation for the fall of the Byzantine Empire and therefore for the triumph of Islam, but rather in that it also split the unity of the Church in a schism which lasts to this present day. Already at the time, peo-

ple in the church and at court, in clerical and in lay circles, had a presentiment of the grave consequences which the condemnation of Dioscoros would bring in its train. Monastic representatives declared before the synod on 17th October 451 that, if Dioscoros were not rehabilitated, the division in Christendom would no longer be able to be removed. Even the conciliar judges saw in the condemnation of Dioscoros not only a great injustice, but also a step heavy with consequences, a step for which the synod would have to account before God. At the synod itself, a considerable opposition set itself, in spite of all the threats, against the Roman legates who had in fact effected the deposition of Dioscoros. There was really no victor in the Chalcedonian dispute. The Church lost power to expand; the power and the very existence of the Empire were shaken. The power and solidarity, which the unity of the Church and the unity of the Empire brought with them, were irretrievably lost.

DISCUSSION: Concerning the Papers of Father Borovoy and Dr. Khella

FATHER ROMANIDES: We should not give the impression that insistence on purity of doctrine is wrong because ensuing schisms helped make barbarian conquests successful. Revelation must never become subject to political expediency. We chose, for example, to submit to the Islamic Turkish yoke rather than compromise our faith by submission to the Pope. Had we compromised at this or any other time, there would now be not much left of Orthodoxy as a witness to the apostolic faith which alone can reunite Christendom. We are duty-bound to God and our Fathers to avoid the sentimentalism of those who foolishly say that we must give and take for the sake of Christian unity, or for the sake of preventing Islam or atheism from swallowing up the Church. We have a responsibility to witness to the true faith regardless of the consequences.

I would like to again express my doubts about Dioscoros' complete faithfulness to Cyril since all indications point to his rejection of Cyril's reconciliatory acts of 433. Also at Chalcedon several witnesses testified that Dioscoros expelled certain people from positions in the Church of Alexandria solely because they were either friends or relatives of St. Cyril. Of course Dioscoros' Orthodoxy and faithfulness to Alexandrian terminology cannot be questioned. But Alexandrian terminology cannot be isolated from the rest of the Church, as clearly demonstrated by St. Cyril himself in 433.

ABBA HABTEMARIAM: The spirit of polemics has led Christians in the past to denounce each other as heretics and unbelievers. It is a fact that

these polemics have not helped the Church to be itself. We must now change from the spirit of polemics to the spirit of unity.

FATHER ROMANIDES: The Oriental Orthodox are perhaps not very familiar with the place of St. Cyril's Twelve Chapters in the Council of Chalcedon (451) and Constantinople (553). It must be emphasized once more that the Council of 553 anathematizes those who do not accept the Twelve Chapters of St. Cyril. Also it must be realized that, according to the minutes and the definition of the Council of Chalcedon, the Tome of Leo was accepted only in the light of and subordinate to the Twelve Chapters of St. Cyril. Whereas the Twelve Chapters of St. Cyril were accepted as the definition and criterion of faith at Ephesus (431), Chalcedon (451) and Constantinople (553), the Tome of Leo does not enjoy the same or equal reputation and can be accepted only in the light of St. Cyril.

PROFESSOR KONIDARIS: The confusion of terminology is derived from the dispute between the two Dionysii (mid 3rd century). The Latin term *substantia* included two possible meanings, rendered in Greek by the terms *hypostasis (prosopon)*, *ousia*, *physis*. In the East the term *hypostasis* has been the prevailing one (with the Cappadocians) denoting the unity of the Person of the Lord in the Trinity), as well as of the historical Christ. Because Apollinaris put forward the problem of the relationship between the two natures in Christ by speaking in terms of the dichotomy of human nature (Neoplatonic theory), automatically the question was raised concerning the fullness of the human nature. Between the two Ecumenical Councils of 431 and 451 the problem of using the appropriate terms was clarified. That is why the Fourth Ecumenical Council does not use the term *physis* (which could create confusion) but *hypostasis* and *prosopon*. The use of the dative case expresses a characteristic of the teaching of the Catholic Orthodox Church against the Monophysites and against the Tome of Leo. The hypostasis of the Divine assumed full and perfect human nature. This teaching was interpreted in a right way by Leontios Byzantios in the sixth century, using the neo-platonic term "*enhypostasis*." Thus the full and perfect human nature "*enhypostatos*," without having an independent existence, has its own existence in the *hypostasis* of the Divine Logos. The return to the confusion about the terms *physis* and *prosopon* after 532 A.D. is due to the policy of the Emperors (for instance Justinian) and of other circles in their efforts to face the false accusations against the Fourth Ecumenical Council of "Nestorianizing." The clarity of the decisions of the Fourth Ecumenical Council has to be explained precisely by the use of the appropriate terms after the death of Cyril (444). It used both terms in the way that my colleague Professor Karmiris has done. Thus the Duophysitism of Nestorius and the Monophysitism of Eutyches were both rejected and defeated.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

P R E F A C E

During the 5th century the first major split within Christendom took place between those who accepted the Council of Chalcedon (451) and those who followed the Synod of Egypt in rejecting it. Attempts at healing this schism have since had a long and tragic history.

Since the 5th century Chalcedonian Christianity experienced further schisms and divisions with the appearance of medieval Roman Catholicism and later of Protestantism. The two Western types of Chalcedonian Christianity are clearly divergents from both the Chalcedonian Orthodox and the non-Chalcedonian Churches.

The papers and minutes published in this volume represent an unofficial attempt on the part of theologians of the Orthodox Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian Churches to evaluate the nature of the 5th century division and the efforts at reunion and to explore possibilities for the future.

Even a superficial study of the papers and discussions will immediately make evident the fact that the Orthodox Chalcedonians have much more in common with the non-Chalcedonians than with the Chalcedonian Roman Catholics and Protestants, although separation with the former is much older than the separation of the latter.

The historical importance of this Unofficial Consultation held at the University of Aarhus, Denmark, August 11-15, 1964, becomes unmistakeably clear from the Agreed Statement on page 14. The reader is advised to study the papers and minutes of this volume in the light of this document.

One will notice that agreement on the faith itself concerning the person of our Lord Jesus Christ was uniformly evident at every stage of the Consultation. No difficulties were encountered, for example, in agreeing on such a key issue as the Christology of St. Cyril of Alexandria. Each side was satisfied with the Orthodoxy of the other side on Christological doctrine.

Difficulties, however, were evident concerning the Tome of Leo and the Council of Chalcedon itself. It should be noted that

the non-Chalcedonian theologians interpreted Chalcedon not very differently from typical Western Chalcedonian scholars. For the same reasons that the latter would accept the Fourth Ecumenical Council and extol its greatness, the former would reject it and lament its failures.

In contrast the Orthodox Chalcedonians insisted that their interpretation of Chalcedon in the light of St. Cyril and the Third (431) and Fifth (553) Ecumenical Councils should be seriously taken into consideration. It is from the viewpoint of this factor that the references to Chalcedon in the Agreed Statement should be read. One must be careful not to interpret the Agreed Statement as an approach by the non-Chalcedonians at Aarhus to the Fourth Ecumenical Council in terms of the usual Western and non-Chalcedonian understanding of it.

Although the participants in this unofficial consultation were very pleased with the results, the future is not as yet clear. It is hoped that something more official will begin to take place as soon as reasonably possible. It is likely that not many leaders of the Orthodox Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian Churches are aware of future possibilities and may thus see little reason to act. It is hoped, therefore, that a wide distribution and careful study of this volume will make all aware of a very possible direction in which the leaders of the two Churches can soon begin to move as indicated in the minutes.

JOHN S. ROMANIDES

INTRODUCTION

It is necessary to give a brief introduction to the minutes of the Consultation which took place in Aarhus, Denmark, 11th-15th August, 1964, in order to explain how this consultation came into being.

The Pan-Orthodox meeting at Rhodes in 1961 considered relationships with the Oriental Orthodox Churches (Armenian, Coptic, Syrian, Ethiopian and Indian) to be one of the most urgent matters in the realm of ecumenical relationships. The same had been felt by those Orthodox from both sides who participated in various meetings of the ecumenical movement in the last two decades.

On a visit to Constantinople on April 22nd 1963, Professor Nissiotis reported to His All-Holiness Patriarch Athenagoras and to the members of the "Pan-Christian Committee" of the Ecumenical Patriarchate that a small strictly unofficial theological consultation could take place, if he were in agreement, between these Churches on the occasion of the meeting of the Commission on Faith and Order, which was to be held in August 1964. The purpose of this meeting would be only to investigate the different theological interpretations regarding the Christological definitions of the Fourth Ecumenical Council in Chalcedon. His All-Holiness gave his benediction and the members of his Committee were fully in agreement.

On the other side, Father Paul Verghese personally submitted the proposal to all the Patriarchs of the Oriental Orthodox Churches and secured their benediction and general approval for holding these theological consultations.

Thereupon, in August 1963, on the occasion of the Conference of Faith and Order in Montreal, Canada, a group of Orthodox from both sides gathered to investigate the possibilities of holding such a meeting the following year. Those present were unanimous that this meeting was necessary, and all agreed that it could be held on the occasion of the next meeting of the Commission on Faith and Order, because most of them had to be present there. Two further meetings of the same kind took place early in September, at Rochester, New York, U.S.A., where the Central Com-

mittee of the WCC was meeting. It was decided that a Preparatory Committee should be formed to carry on the correspondence with the persons invited, and that the Committee should be formed of people living in Geneva, who had the means to carry on the correspondence and suggest a program. This committee was composed of Father Paul Verghese for the non-Chalcedonian Churches, Professor Nick A. Nissiotis for the Chalcedonian Churches, together with Dr. Lukas Vischer as representative of the Faith and Order staff in Geneva.

The Faith and Order Commission from the beginning showed great interest and expressed its desire to help with such a meeting, as falling within the scope of the assistance rendered by Faith and Order to member Churches in organizing such meetings and in promoting theological discussion among them. Since all these Orthodox Churches are members of the WCC, this way of arranging an unofficial meeting was regarded by all those who participated in the preparatory gatherings in Montreal and Rochester as perfectly proper. The Consultation officially expressed its warm thanks to the Faith and Order Commission for all their assistance in order to make the meeting possible. The three members of the Preparatory Committee were in permanent contact with the two bishops resident in Geneva, Bishop Emilianos of Meloa, representing the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, and Bishop Vladimir of Zvenigorod, representing the Russian Orthodox Church.

The theme was definitely settled and the program arranged only after the agreement of all the theologians invited. The minutes show that the small number of less than twenty theologians, the two sides being evenly balanced, gathered at Aarhus on the occasion of the meeting of the Commission on Faith and Order. The consultation remained faithful to its purpose, made clear right from the beginning, to seek only to clarify the theological differences between the two traditions and to inform the governing bodies of the Orthodox Churches about the current positions maintained by the two traditions concerning the Christological dogma. It becomes evident that an extraordinarily clear agreement was reached concerning the essence of the Christological dogma, something which may be of the greatest importance for future meetings and negotiations between these Churches. The hope that we would like to express at this point is that this first step will be followed by other efforts sponsored by the Holy Synods of our Churches,

so that in the near future we reach the happy stage of official negotiations in order to restore unity in the Orthodox world. It is to serve this great purpose, trusting in God's help, that this first unofficial step was taken.

PAUL VERGHESE

NICK A. NISSIOTIS

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE CONSULTATION

EASTERN ORTHODOX PARTICIPANTS:

His Grace Bishop *Emilianos* (Timiadis) of Meloa, World Council of Churches, GENEVA, Switzerland (Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople)

The Very Rev. Professor G. *Florovsky* (Professor Emeritus, Harvard University), Princeton University, PRINCETON, New Jersey, U.S.A. (Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople)

The Very Rev. Professor J. S. *Romanides*, Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Theological School, 50 Goddard Ave., BROOKLINE, Mass., 02146, U.S.A. (Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople)

The Very Rev. Professor Vitaly *Borovoy*, World Council of Churches, GENEVA, Switzerland (Russian Orthodox Church)

The Rev. Professor J. *Meyendorff*, St. Vladimir's Orthodox Seminary, 575 Scarsdale Road, Crestwood, TUCKAHOE, N. Y., U.S.A. (Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America)

Professor J. N. *Karmiris*, University of Athens, 20 Dionysou St., Kifissia, ATHENS, Greece (Church of Greece)

Professor G. *Konidaris*, University of Athens, 84 Academy St., ATHENS, Greece (Church of Greece)

ORIENTAL ORTHODOX PARTICIPANTS:

His Grace Archbishop *Tiran* Nersoyan, St. Nersess Armenian Theological School, Ouzoonian House, 1456 Ridge Avenue, EVANSTON, Ill. 60201, U.S.A. (Armenian Apostolic Church)

His Grace Bishop *Karekin Sarkessian*, Armenian Theological Seminary, ANTELIAS, Lebanon (Armenian Apostolic Church, Catholicosate of Cilicia)

His Grace Archbishop *Mar Severius* Zakka Iwas of Mosul, MOSUL, Iraq (Syrian Orthodox Church)

His Grace Metropolitan *Mar Thoma Dionysius*, Mount Tabor,

PATHANAPURAM, Kerala, India (Orthodox Syrian Church of the East)

The Rev. Father Dr. N. J. *Thomas*, Assistant to His Grace Mar Thoma Dionysius, Mount Tabor Monastery (Orthodox Syrian Church of the East)

Like Siltanat *Habte Mariam* Worgineh, Dean of the Cathedral of the Holy Trinity, Member of His Imperial Majesty's private Cabinet, P.O. Box 3137, ADDIS ABABA, Ethiopia (Ethiopian Orthodox Church)

The Rev. Professor V. C. *Samuel*, Theological College, P.O. Box 665, ADDIS ABABA, Ethiopia (Orthodox Syrian Church of the East)

Dr. Karam Nazir *Khella*, Lecturer, Philosophische Fakultät Hamburg; Theological Faculty Cairo, Johns-Allee 65, 2 HAMBURG 13, Postfach 2655, Germany (Coptic Orthodox Church)

Dr. *Getachew Haile*, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Arts, Haile Selassie I University, P.O. Box 399, ADDIS ABABA, Ethiopia (Ethiopian Orthodox Church)

STAFF:

Dr. N. A. *Nissiotis*, Ecumenical Institute, World Council of Churches, Château de Bossey, CELIGNY (GE), Switzerland (Church of Greece)

The Rev. Father Paul *Vergheze*, World Council of Churches, GENEVA, Switzerland (Orthodox Syrian Church of the East)

The Rev. Dr. Lukas *Vischer*, Research Secretary of the Faith and Order Department, World Council of Churches, GENEVA, Switzerland

August 14th, 1964, Evening Session.

AN AGREED STATEMENT

Ever since the second decade of our century representatives of our Orthodox Churches, some accepting seven Ecumenical Councils and others accepting three, have often met in ecumenical gatherings. The desire to know each other and to restore our unity in the one Church of Christ has been growing all these years. Our meeting together in Rhodos at the Pan-Orthodox Conference of 1961 confirmed this desire.

Out of this has come about our unofficial gathering of fifteen theologians from both sides, for three days of informal conversations, in connection with the meeting of the Faith and Order Commission in Aarhus, Denmark.

We have spoken to each other in the openness of charity and with the conviction of truth. All of us have learned from each other. Our inherited misunderstandings have begun to clear up. We recognize in each other the one orthodox faith of the Church. Fifteen centuries of alienation have not led us astray from the faith of our Fathers.

In our common study of the Council of Chalcedon, the well-known phrase used by our common Father in Christ, St. Cyril of Alexandria, *mia physis* (or *mia hypostasis*) *tou Theou logou sesarkomene* (the one *physis* or *hypostasis* of God's Word Incarnate) with its implications, was at the centre of our conversations. On the essence of the Christological dogma we found ourselves in full agreement. Through the different terminologies used by each side, we saw the same truth expressed. Since we agree in rejecting without reservation the teaching of Eutyches as well as of Nestorius, the acceptance or non-acceptance of the Council of Chalcedon does not entail the acceptance of either heresy. Both sides found themselves fundamentally following the Christological teaching of the one undivided Church as expressed by St. Cyril.

The Council of Chalcedon (451), we realize, can only be understood as reaffirming the decisions of Ephesus (431), and best understood in the light of the later Council of Constantinople (553). All councils, we have recognized, have to be seen as stages

in an integral development and no council or document should be studied in isolation.

The significant role of political, sociological and cultural factors in creating tension between factions in the past should be recognized and studied together. They should not, however, continue to divide us.

We see the need to move forward together. The issue at stake is of crucial importance to all churches in the East and West alike and for the unity of the whole Church of Jesus Christ.

The Holy Spirit, Who indwells the Church of Jesus Christ, will lead us together to the fullness of truth and of love. To that end we respectfully submit to our churches the fruit of our common work of three days together. Many practical problems remain, but the same Spirit Who led us together here will, we believe, continue to lead our churches to a common solution of these.

HIS GRACE BISHOP EMILIANOS
OF MELOA
(Ecumenical Patriarchate
of Constantinople)

THE VERY REV. PROFESSOR
G. FLOROVSKY
(Greek Orthodox Archdiocese
of North and South America,
Ecumenical Patriarchate
of Constantinople)

THE VERY REV. PROFESSOR
J. S. ROMANIDES
(Greek Orthodox Archdiocese
of North and South America,
Ecumenical Patriarchate
of Constantinople)

THE VERY REV. PROFESSOR
VITALY BOROVY
(Russian Orthodox Church)

THE REV. PROFESSOR
J. MEYENDORFF
(Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic
Church of North America)

PROFESSOR J. KARMIRIS
(Church of Greece)

PROFESSOR G. KONIDARIS
(Church of Greece)

HIS GRACE ARCHBISHOP
TIRAN NERSOYAN
(Armenian Apostolic Church)

HIS GRACE BISHOP
KAREKIN SARKISSIAN
(Armenian Apostolic Church,
Catholicosate of Cilicia)

HIS GRACE ARCHBISHOP
MAR SEVERIUS ZAKKA IWAS
OF MOSUL
(Syrian Orthodox Church)

HIS GRACE METROPOLITAN
MAR THOMA DIONYSIUS
(Orthodox Syrian Church
of the East)

THE VERY REV. LIKE SULTANAT
HABTE MARIAM WORQINEH
(Ethiopian Orthodox Church)

THE REV. PROFESSOR
V. C. SAMUEL
(Orthodox Syrian Church
of the East)

DR. KARAM NAZIR KHELLA
(Coptic Orthodox Church)

DR. GETACHEW HAILE
(Ethiopian Orthodox Church)

August 12th, 1964, Morning Session.

CHALCEDONIANS AND MONOPHYSITES AFTER CHALCEDON

By THE REV. PROFESSOR J. MEYENDORFF

The circumstances of the great schism which divided the Eastern Church in connection with the Council of Chalcedon are generally better known than the various efforts which were made later by the Byzantine emperors and the Byzantine Church to heal the schism. As a matter of fact, throughout the sixth and seventh centuries, right until the Arab conquest of the Middle East, the problem of the schism dominated Byzantine religious policy in the East, and many contemporary attitudes of ours find their roots in the positive or negative steps taken in those times. It is relatively easy for us today to appreciate at their real value, the monumental mistakes made, and also the crimes committed, every time that the Emperors tried to solve the dispute by force. For us, today, there is no doubt about the fact that the military repression of Monophysitism in Egypt, and in other places; the imposition of a Chalcedonian hierarchy by Byzantine police; the frequent exile of the real, popular leaders of the Church of Egypt played a decisive role in giving to the schism the character of a national resistance to Byzantine ecclesiastical and political control of Egypt, Syria and Armenia. For centuries, the Orthodox Chalcedonians were considered as "Melchites" — the "people of the Emperor" — by the non-Greek Christians of the Middle East. And Chalcedonian Orthodoxy itself tended, more and more, to identify itself exclusively with the cultural, liturgical and theological tradition of the Church of Constantinople, losing contact and communion with the venerable ancient traditions of Egypt and Syria.

The historical circumstances, which made possible all these mistakes in the past, do not exist any more. No empire is in a position to *impose* union between Monophysites and Dyophysites. No one envisages this union otherwise than through unity of faith, and every opportunity is given to us to settle our difficulties with no other reference than Love and faithfulness to revealed Truth. It is therefore time for all of us to look back on our respective traditions in order to see clearly the *real* issues, to isolate what we

consider as Holy Tradition from all human attachments and prejudices, however venerable they may be, and to recognize that divine Truth may often be expressed in different ways without the unity in Christ being broken.

The purpose of my paper is to examine briefly the *theological* work which was performed by Byzantine theologians in the sixth century in order to meet the Monophysite objections to Chalcedon, and to try to find whether the wisdom of the past could not help us in solving the problems of today.

1. CHALCEDON CHALLENGED

The Great Assembly of 451, which appeared to be by far the most numerous and the most representative of all the previous councils of the Church, was however rejected by large Christian bodies, which stood for a Christology affirming that Christ had *one nature*, and not two. It is to be understood that by the technical term "monophysite" is designated not the Eutychians but all those who, after 451, continued to consider the Cyrilian formula *mia physis tou Theou Logou sesarkomene* as the best way of expressing the Christological mystery, and who accepted the leadership of such prominent theologians as Philoxenos of Mabbug or Severus of Antioch. As modern research has shown, "the monophysite doctrine of the Incarnation, especially in the scientific form which was given to it by Severus, is nothing else than Cyrilian christology."¹ The main concern of the Chalcedonians, who also claimed faithfulness to Cyril, will therefore consist in proving that the definition of 451 is nothing but a new expression of Cyrilism, aimed at answering the problems raised by the Eutychian heresy. The Emperors, interested in reaching a quick and final reconciliation, often pushed this tendency to the extreme, and tried to "forget" Chalcedon completely. The *Henotikon* issued in 482 by Emperor Zeno is the most famous example of these attempts; it did find some acceptance among moderate Monophysites only, and alienated the entire Christian West. The repeated failures of this purely formal and political approach to the problem led the theologians to elaborate a philosophical justification for the Chalcedonian formula, while giving full credit to the central intuition of St. Cyril of Alexandria that Christ was essentially one single *Being*. Thus they found it possible to maintain the validity of

¹ J. Lebon, *Le Monophysisme severien* (Louvain, 1909), p. xxi.

both terminological systems — that of Cyril and that of Chalcedon — on condition that they were not considered as contradictory in their meaning. This tendency found its ultimate expression in the Fifth Ecumenical Council (553) and thus committed the Orthodox Church as a whole. It seems to provide the only possible direction of solving the schism which divides Eastern Christians among themselves since the fifth century.

In general, this tendency, baptized “neo-chalcedonian” by modern critics, is not very popular in the West. We know how difficult it was for Justinian to obtain the endorsement of the Council by Pope Vigilius. And even today many consider the whole development of Byzantine Christology in the time of Justinian as a capitulation before Monophysitism. It is clear, therefore, that the issue is much wider than a simple discovery of a union formula between Dyophysites and Monophysites: it raises the problem of Christology as a whole and touches upon questions arising between Christian East and Christian West, and also those arising within each of them. All this gives to our consultation a broader ecumenical significance, which we must responsibly realize.

The main and essential innovation of the Chalcedonian definition was to apply to Christology the concepts used in the doctrine of the Trinity by the Cappadocian Fathers. In God there are three Persons, or *hypostases*, and one essence, or nature: thus the term *hypostasis* designates the particular and the individual, while “essence” or “nature” indicates the common deity. In Christ, one single Person being both God and man, it is necessary to say that there are two natures in one *hypostasis*.

It is doubtful whether or not the Council was conscious of the difficulties which would soon arise from this necessary terminological innovation. Thus, when John the Grammarian published between 514 and 518 a learned Apology of the Council based upon the Cappadocian terminology, he in fact offered to Severus of Antioch new arguments to justify his opposition to Chalcedon. According to the Council, Christ is “consubstantial (*homoousios*) with the Father according to his Divinity and consubstantial (*homoousios*) with us according to his humanity.” But since the divine substance (*ousia*), according to Athanasius — whose doctrine the Cappadocians admitted by identifying *ousia* and *physis* — is a concrete reality, in a platonic sense (there is indeed *one* God in three *hypostases*), it appeared to many that the Council was affirming the incarnation of the entire Trinity. For the Son

and the Father are but one God. And since Christ is "consubstantial with us" as he is consubstantial with the Father, one should be able to say that he is "one man" with us. On the other hand, is it possible to conceive concretely the humanity of Christ without saying that his human nature is also a human *hypostasis*?

These are the difficulties which prevented the great theologians of sixth century moderate Monophysitism to accept Chalcedon. Thus Severus of Antioch formally distinguishes *ousia* from *physis*, and gives to *ousia* an abstract sense: for him, "essence" is an Aristotelian *deutera ousia*.² He admits in Christ two "esses" (*ousiae*), but united into one single concrete reality, called *hypostasis*, or *physis*, while rejecting the doctrine of the extreme Eutychians or "synousiasts" who considered that there was in Christ one single "essence." It is clear, therefore, that Severus considers the Cappadocian Trinitarian terminology as radically inapplicable to Christology.

Facing his challenge, the Dyophysite theologians will develop a more precise and elaborate conception of *hypostasis*, following a direction which was already initiated by the Cappadocians, and going beyond both Aristotelianism and Platonism. These new precisions will, in fact, lead to new developments in the trinitarian theology itself.

Apollinarius of Laodicea seems to have been first to apply the word *hypostasis* to Christology,³ in order to designate the unity of the Word with the flesh in one single reality. As is well known, Apollinarius was condemned for not recognizing that Christ was fully man, but many of his writings circulated in the fifth century under the pseudonym of St. Athanasius. This led many theologians to ascribe Apollinarian expressions to the great champion of Orthodoxy against Arianism. Cyril was one of the most prominent victims of the forgery; he adopted the expression "unity according to *hypostasis*" as the formula *par excellence* designating the unique being of Christ, and accepted also another obviously Apollinarian expression — "one nature of the Word of God incarnate" — as a subsidiary description of the Christological mys-

² Cf. J. Lebon, *op. cit.*, pp. 354, 376-388.

³ M. Richard, "L'introduction du mot *hypostase* dans la theologie de l'Incarnation," in *Melanges de sciences religieuses*, 2 (1945), pp. 5-32, 243-270.

tery.⁴ The second, only later, became a point of contention between Chalcedonians and Monophysites, while the first was accepted by the Council itself. This acceptance should, in fact, have sufficed to wash away Chalcedon from every accusation of Nestorianism, for *hypostasis* did indeed have, in the fifth century, a strong and concrete meaning. Its adoption by Chalcedon meant a great concession to Cyrillism on the part of both the Westerners and the Antiochians, for it undoubtedly evoked in Antiochian ears the ever-feared Apollinarian confusion of divinity and humanity.

What made their acceptance of the Chalcedonian formula possible was that the formula "two natures" was also included. The Council therefore adopted a system which implied that Christ was really "one" and really "two."

Since their semi-arian past, the Cappadocians were also accustomed to understand *hypostasis* as a concrete reality, and it took a serious effort on their part to accept the Athanasian *homoousios* and to overcome the Arian temptation of completely separating the Father, the Son and the Spirit.⁵ The very originality of their system was that neither *ousia* nor *hypostases* were considered as abstractions and that God was viewed as *really* one and *really* three: this paradox implies, of course, that the categories of Greek philosophy were overcome from inside — even if the terms remained Greek — and justifies the Christological use of the system at Chalcedon.

Thus the notion of *hypostasis* finds itself at the very centre of the Christological debates which followed the great Council of 451; its clarification required all the laborious dialectics of Byzantine theologians striving to reconcile Cyril and Chalcedon. It is difficult to find many exciting figures among them: their manner of handling the issue was often formal and scholastic, and the writings of contemporary Monophysites like Severus and Philoxenus represent much more of the soteriological freshness of the great Alexandrian theology, that of Athanasius and that of Cyril, than the refinements of Byzantine theology cultivated in Constantinople. However, the survival of Dyophysitism in the East is essentially due to the work of Byzantine "grammarians," and also, of course, to the Chalcedonian firmness of the Church of Rome.

⁴ Cf. P. Galtier, "L'unio secundum hypostasim chez saint Cyrille," in *Gregorianum*, XXXIII, 1952, pp. 351-398.

⁵ Cf. G. L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought* (London, 1952), p. 242.

2. LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM

Among the Byzantine theologians of the age of Justinian, Leontius of Byzantium deserves a special mention. His contribution to Christology resides in his doctrine of *hypostasis*, which will later be integrated in the mainstream of Byzantine theology by Maximus the Confessor and John of Damascus.

In his apology of Chalcedon, Leontius was obliged to explain why *hypostasis* and "nature" (*physis*) were no more to be considered as synonymous. If *ousia* and *physis* designate what in Christ is common with the Father on the one hand and with humanity on the other, what is the particular meaning of *hypostasis*? In St. Basil, *hypostasis* was distinct from the "essence" by the respective "peculiarities" of the Father, the Son and the Spirit, while "essence" represented their common Being. The Cappadocian Fathers could also speak of the *hypostasis* as "modes of existence" of the one single divine essence. However, they never considered the *hypostases* as simple expressions of the essence: for St. Gregory of Nazianzus, the *hypostases* "possessed" Divinity (*ta hon he Theotes*); Divinity was "in them" (*ta en hois he Theotes*).⁶ *Hypostasis* is therefore not only a particular and concrete reality, it is the *subject* who possesses and reveals the Being of God. The "hypostatic characteristics" describe it and define it, but they do not constitute it.

The personalistic aspect of the Cappadocian theology is applied by Leontius to christology. From all eternity, Divinity was "in the Son." It was "enhypostasized" in Him. At the Incarnation, humanity also entered "in Him." The Son exists not only as God, but also as man. *Hypostasis* therefore is not only distinct from divine nature but it is capable of assuming another nature. It is not a simple "mode of existence" of a nature, but the very principle of any existence, and, in the case of Christ, the very personal Object of our encounter with the God-Man. *Hypostasis* is that which exists by itself (*kath' heauto*), which designates *somebody* (*ton tina deloi*). Nature is a pure abstraction when it is not "enhypostasized" (*ouk esti physis anhypostatos*); in fact, it is what Leontius calls an *enhypostaton*, a reality which does not exist by itself, but in a *hypostasis*.

Leontius' theology undoubtedly has the appearance of dry

⁶ *Poem. dogm. xx*, 3 P.G. 37, col 414 A; *Hom. 39, 11*, P.G. 36, col. 345 D.

scholasticism, based upon Aristotelian terminology. One must realize, however, that the issue between Chalcedonians and Monophysites was essentially a terminological one, and that it was precisely a terminological elaboration which was needed. And in general one can say that theology, inasmuch as it is a means of communication, must be a science of precision and accuracy And there cannot be any doubt about the fact that Leontius' elaboration of the notion of *hypostasis*, as the personal being and the "being-in-itself," is alone able to secure the possibility of transferring the Cappadocian terminology into Christology.⁷ For if one defines *hypostasis* simply as the *individual* existence of a generic nature, or as the internal expression of an essence, it would be inevitable to recognize in Christ two *hypostases*, two individuals, two persons. This is precisely what Severus of Antioch saw in the Chalcedonian definition, since he refused to distinguish between *hypostasis* and nature. The Chalcedonian Christ thus appeared to him as a synthesis of two distinct beings. On the other hand, the existence in Christ of a distinct human nature signified for Severus that the Son of God had assumed an *individual* of the human race, and not human nature as such. The whole soteriological intuition of Cyril thus seemed to disappear.

However, there cannot be any doubt about the fact that both the Council of Chalcedon and Leontius of Byzantium remain essentially faithful to that intuition. Christ, for them, is *one being*, and this is signified precisely by the notion of *hypostatic union*. *Hypostasis* alone gives reality to both natures, but without destroying their characteristics. They exist in *hypostasis*, but they exist *really*. Divinity and humanity are thus distinct not only "in the mind" (*kata ten epinoian*), as Severus was ready to admit, but in act (*te energeia*),⁸ each preserving its own "energy."⁹ However, their common subject is the same *hypostasis* of the *Logos*, which is not limited by its own nature and can really assume and make hers another nature. The *Logos*, being "in the flesh," possesses the full reality of human life: he is born, he dies, he is

⁷ On Leontius' christology, see A. Theodorou, "Christologike horologia didaskalia Leontiou tou Byzantiou," in *Theologia*, 26 (Athens, 1955), pp. 212-222, 421-435, 584-592; 27 (1956), pp. 32-44. S. Verkhovskoy, "Some Theological Reflexions on Chalcedon," in *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly*, vol. 2, 1958, no. 1, pp. 2-12.

⁸ *Epilysis, P.G.*, 86, col. 1932 C.

⁹ *Contra Nest. et Eutychianos, ibid.*, col. 132 B.

tempted, he is hungry, he is ignorant *as a man*. Thus the notion of hypostatic union leads to the idea of the "communication of idioms"¹⁰ on the one hand, the *Logos* acts according to humanity which He assumed, and, on the other hand, humanity, "enhypostasized" in Him, "becomes itself and through Him the source of all the gifts of the Logos."¹¹ Thus, the human "energy" is assumed by the Logos, and the flesh of Christ, to which all those who are "in Christ" participate, assumes a divine energy, for it is the Logos itself who acts in it. This is the Christological foundation of the patristic doctrine of "participation" and "deification" which will later be further developed in Byzantine theology.

3. THE FIFTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL (553)

A supreme effort of reconciliation with the Monophysites was made during the reign of Justinian and culminated with the Council of 553, which reaffirmed the total faithfulness of the Byzantine Church to the theology of St. Cyril of Alexandria and condemned previous theological writings contradicting him in any way.

We have seen that the doctrine of hypostatic union implied the notion of "*communicatio idiomatum*." Chalcedon itself had incorporated the word *Theotokos* in its Christological definition: this word alone, by reaffirming the decision of Ephesus condemning Nestorius, implied that Christ was one single Person — God the Word — of Whom Mary was the Mother. However, since Chalcedon sounded "Nestorian" in the ears of the Monophysites, in spite of its acceptance of *Theotokos*, it was necessary to accentuate the other implications of the hypostatic union. The so-called "theopaschite" formulae, encouraged by Justinian and formally endorsed by the Council of 553, will tend to this end: these formulae affirmed the notion that God Himself suffered death on the Cross, and not an "assumed man" only "united with God" as Nestorian theology would put it. And indeed, was it not necessary that the Son of God made human death really *His own* in order to destroy it? To speak of the "death of God" seemed, of course, rather shocking, and, strictly speaking, the theopaschite formulae were incomplete as long as it was not specified that this "death of God" could occur only "in the flesh," that is, in Christ's human nature; but they were undoubtedly correct, for a real death could

¹⁰ *Epilysis*, *ibid.*, col. 1945 C, D.

¹¹ *Contra Nest. et Eutychianos*, *ibid.*, col. 1337 A.

only be "somebody's" death: for only *somebody* — a hypostasis, a person — can die, not a nature, and in Christ there was no other person, no other *hypostasis* than that of the Son of God incarnate.¹² To speak of the "death of God" in the flesh was, in fact, not uncommon since the time of Ignatius of Antioch (*Pathos tou Theou*, Rom. 6:3), and the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed itself affirms explicitly our faith in the "Son of God . . . incarnate of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary . . . crucified for us under Pontius Pilate."

Opposition to all forms of the *communicatio idiomatum* and to the theological expressions which implied it — such as *Theotokos*, or "death of God" was, in fact, the essential characteristic of Nestorianism, and their acceptance constituted, in the sixth century, the meeting ground on which Chalcedonians and Monophysites could unite in a common faithfulness to the memory of St. Cyril of Alexandria. For it is on this ground that Cyril had opposed Nestorius, affirming not only that Mary had to be called *Theotokos*, but also that one was obliged to say that "God had tasted death in the flesh" (*thanaton geusamenon sarki*, Anath, 12).

Since Leontius of Byzantium had given the possibility of using these formulae in a non-Apollinarian sense and without contradicting Chalcedon, Justinian accepted them as a criterion of Orthodoxy and as a bridge between the Chalcedonians and the Monophysites. The expression 'One of the Holy Trinity has suffered,' used at first by the so-called Scythian monks, was thus included in the preamble of Justinian's Code Laws (528), in the hymn *Monogenes Huios*, composed by Justinian himself, which became a sort of Christological confession of faith, and was included in the Byzantine liturgy, and in all the doctrinal statements of the time. The formula was accepted even in Rome (534). Its significance is to affirm the unity of Christ's being: Christians recognize only one Saviour, the incarnate Son of God, who was born of a Virgin and died for us, and not two: the Son of God and the man Jesus.

¹² The use of the 'theopaschite' formulae is frequently considered as 'unbearable' by modern Western theologians (cf. for example Ch. Moeller, 'Le Chalcédonisme et le néo-chalcédonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du V^e siècle' in Grillmeier-Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, I, pp. 637-720). They are admitted as self-evident by Orthodox theologians (cf. for example M. Oksiuk, "Teopaskhistskie spory" in *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii*, 1913, 1, pp. 529-559; G. Florovsky, *Vizantiiskie Ottsy*, p. 129). A fresh and more hopeful understanding of the issue is however found in the several works devoted to Cyrillian Christology by F. Diepen.

The *same one* was born of all eternity from the Father, and became, in time, the Son of Mary; *the same* is immortal in His divine nature and died for us according to the flesh.

The clarification of these major Christological issues seemed to bring fruit, and serious hopes for a reunification of Eastern Christendom arose in the beginning of Justinian's reign. The question which remained unsettled was of a rather formal nature and concerned several canonical decisions of the Council of Chalcedon. Thus, at a consultation held in Constantinople in 533, one of the major objections raised against the Council was that it had accepted into the communion of the Church two Antiochene theologians, Theodoret of Cyrus and Ibas of Edessa, who in the past had openly opposed Cyril of Alexandria and rejected the 'theopaschite' formulae. Both were, just as their friend Nestorius, the disciples of the great master of the Antiochene exegetical school, Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose Christology was reputed to be that of two *hypostases* in Christ. Of course, Theodoret had to anathematize Nestorius in Chalcedon, but his writings still included polemics against the great Cyril, whom the Monophysites considered the only safe authority in Christology. Thus the so-called affair of the "Three Chapters" became the issue which would lead to the Fifth Ecumenical Council.

In 544, Justinian published a decree anathematizing each one of the "Three Chapters," that is:

- 1) The person of Theodore of Mopsuestia.
- 2) The writings of Theodoret directed against Cyril of Alexandria and the Council of Ephesus.
- 3) The letter of Ibas to Maris the Persian which presented the reconciliation of 433 between Cyril and the Antiochenes as a capitulation of the latter before the evidence of Antiochene terminology.

Historically, the whole issue of the "Three Chapters" may appear to us as strange in many respects. Was this anathema against men who died in communion with the Church at all necessary? Modern historians, often sympathetic to Nestorianism, generally condemn it as futile and morbid, and consider the policy of Justinian as a capitulation before Monophysitism. It seems to me, however, that both its theological meaning and its "ecumenical" dimension can be of great use to us.

First of all, it is to be noted that the condemnation touched

only those writings of Theodoret and Ibas which opposed Cyril, and supported the thesis that Chalcedon was incompatible with Alexandrian theology: Justinian's policy was based upon the conviction that they *were* compatible and complementary. Justinian thus refrained from condemning the Antiochene school of theology as such, with its essential and, for us, unavoidable insistence on the full reality of Christ's *human* nature and existence. In fact, in Chalcedon, the Council's majority, which was Cyrillian in its doctrinal convictions and theological formation, recognizing the dangers of Eutychian, extreme Monophysitism, had already attempted a reconciliation between Antioch and Alexandria. It admitted the validity of both theologies, by putting them side by side and by providing a tentative, and, in fact improvised, new terminological system of Christology. The theological work done during the age of Justinian, which culminated with the Fifth Ecumenical Council, was in fact a really creative synthesis which showed that Chalcedon and Alexandria, with their somewhat diverging terminologies, could be really *true* only when seen in the light of each other. In spite of its rather turbulent history, its politically unpleasant background and its unusual and formally controversial result — the condemnation of three men who died more than half a century earlier — the Fifth Council appears to be a good example of how the Tradition of the Church shows its real continuity by putting aside mutually excluding elements and by discovering the Truth which is above all questions of personalities.

Justinian's decree of 544, which was intended to settle the matter, soon appeared to be insufficient for a really catholic acceptance of the imperial policy. It was then followed by an imperial Confession of Faith (551) which, in fact, described the agenda of the future Council. While endorsing Chalcedon, vigorously condemning all confusion (*sygchysis*) of natures in Christ, and rejecting the Severian reluctance to "count the number" (*arithmos*) of natures, Justinian proposes Leontius' notion of a "composite hypostasis" (*hypostasis synthetos*), in which and through which the two natures exist and outside of which they are only abstractions. But he gives credit to Severus in admitting that the two natures are to be distinguished not as "two things," but only "in word and in thought" (*logo mono kai theoria*).¹⁸ And finally,

¹⁸ Ed. E. Schwartz, "Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians," in *Ab-*

the imperial Confession proclaims the orthodoxy of the Cyrillian formula "one nature of the Word God incarnate." He writes: "We accept the expression of St. Cyril, . . . for each time that the Father [Cyril] used it, he used the word *nature* instead of the word *hypostasis*."¹⁴

Thus, the difference between Cyril and Chalcedon was, according to Justinian, of a purely verbal nature, and was inevitable by the very fact that *nobody*, in the time of Cyril, saw any formal difference of meaning between *hypostasis* and *physis*.

The Council of 553 itself confirmed this position of Justinian. It rejected vigorously all attempts to interpret Chalcedon in a Nestorian sense.

Anathema 5: "If anyone shall calumniate the Holy Council of Chalcedon, pretending that it made use of this expression [one hypostasis] in this [Nestorian] impious sense, and if he will not recognize rather that the Word of God is united with the flesh hypostatically, and that therefore there is but one hypostasis or one only Person, and that the Holy Council of Chalcedon has professed in this sense the one Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema."

Anathema 14: "If anyone . . . shall presume to defend [Nestorianism, or the Three Chapters] in the name of the Holy Fathers or of the Holy Council of Chalcedon . . . , let him be anathema."

The Council also reiterated forcefully the unity of *subject* in Christ: an issue which was indeed not quite clear in the Antiochene tradition connected with Theodore of Mopsuestia:

Anathema 3: "If anyone shall say that the wonder-working Word of God is one [Person] and the Christ that suffered another; or shall say that God the Word was *with* Christ, born of a woman, or was *in* Him as one person in another, but that he was not one and the same, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, incarnate and made man, and that his miracles and the sufferings which of his own will he endured in the flesh were not of the same [Person], let him be anathema."

"Theopaschism" is endorsed formally by *Anathema 10*:

"If anyone does not confess that our Lord Jesus Christ who

handlungen der Münchener Akad. der Wissenschaften, Neue F. 18 (München, 1939), pp. 72-111; for Severus' position, see J. Lebon, *op. cit.*, pp. 345-368.

¹⁴ *Ed. cit.*, p. 78, lines 5-10.

was crucified in the flesh *is* true God, and the Lord of Glory, and one of the Holy Trinity, let him be anathema."

There cannot be any doubt that the main purpose of the Council was to show that nothing of the Cyrillian position against Nestorius was, in any way, disavowed by Chalcedon. Even the Council of Ephesus, presided over by Cyril himself, did not go as far as confirming everything which Cyril had written against Nestorius. The Fathers of 553 formally proclaimed:

Anathema 13: "If anyone does not anathematize . . . all those who have written contrary to the true faith or against Saint Cyril and his Twelve Chapters . . . let him be anathema."

The "Twelve Chapters" of Cyril were indeed often considered as an extreme Alexandrian position, and their endorsement by the Chalcedonians shows how far they were ready to go to meet their Monophysite brethren. The "Twelve Chapters" of Cyril did not contain, however, the famous formula on "one nature," which was made a sort of symbol by post-Chalcedonian Monophysites. This omission shows, in fact, that Cyril did not at all attribute to it the same importance as did some of his later disciples, and that the expression *one hypostasis*, not *one nature*, was, for him, the standard Christological expression. However, in 553, since a case was made for the formula "one nature," the Byzantine Church, following Justinian's *Confession*, accepted it also, with the reservation that it should not be considered an argument whether *for* Eutyches, or *against* Chalcedon.

Anathema 13: "If anyone uses the expression 'of two natures' [accepted by Cyril, and by Monophysites as Dioscoros and Severus], confessing that a union was made of the Godhead and of the humanity, or the expression 'the one nature of God the Word incarnate,' and shall not so understand those expressions as the Holy Fathers have taught, to wit: that of the divine and human nature there was made an hypostatic union, whereof is one Christ; but from these expressions shall try to introduce one nature or *ousia* [made by mixture] of the Godhead and manhood of Christ; let him be anathema."

It is clear, therefore, that the Council of 553 made its own the entire Christology of St. Cyril of Alexandria, which was based upon the intuition that the Saviour could only be One and that this One is God. To appreciate it fully, it is always necessary to discover this soteriological dimension of Alexandrian theology, which, in the case of Athanasius and Cyril, was not at all a specu-

lation, but the reaffirmation of a Biblical fact, so close also today to Reformed "Neo-Orthodoxy," that *God alone* can save. If it was not God himself, but a man Jesus, only "united with God," who was born of Mary, died and rose again, salvation is not achieved. If it is not God — "One of the Holy Trinity" — who made *his own* our very death, as the last expression of our entire fallen condition, which He came to repair and recuperate, if He is not himself the *subject* of the redemptive act in its entirety, nothing is achieved and, even grammatically, the Nicene Creed is nothing but a misunderstanding, for it affirms that "the Son of God . . . was crucified."

But this Cyrillian theology does have a meaning only if what was assumed by God was the human nature in its full and dynamic entirety. Jesus Christ was fully man in His mind, His soul, in His body; He thought, He felt, He suffered, He ignored, He died, as we do. In nothing of all that are we alone any more, but God is with us. Jesus thus possessed a human nature, but not a human *hypostasis*, because the hypostasis is not an expression of natural existence, but something which gives natural existence a conscious, autonomous, personal reality. This "something" in the man — Jesus — was God the Word, who assumed humanity. Here lies the inevitable and necessary truth of Chalcedon.

As a matter of conclusion, I would like to stress two points. It seems to me that an agreement on these points is a condition of all practical steps towards union between Chalcedonians and Monophysites today . . . and we all believe that such a union is possible since, both in the distant and in the recent past, we seemed to have agreed that the difference between us lies rather in terminology than in theology itself.

1. Theological terminology can only partially, and always somehow inaccurately, express the Truth. It is nothing else than a means of communication, an instrument used by the Church to convey its teaching. This is why the Orthodox is not, and has never been, a "confessional" church. It never accepted to be defined — and therefore limited — by the text of a Confession. Neither the Creed of Nicæa-Constantinople, nor the definitions of the Ecumenical Councils can be considered as defining the fullness of Orthodoxy. If the Creed has acquired a permanent value by its inclusion in the Liturgy, the conciliar definitions are essentially *ad hoc* statements, which can be understood only against the

background of the heresy condemned by them. They do, of course, reflect and witness to an absolute and unchangeable Truth, but this Truth is a living One, which exists in the organic continuity of the One Church of Christ. A Council is ecumenical, and its decision is infallible when it has defined *something* of this permanent and organic Truth, while no human words, and therefore no conciliar definition, can pretend to have exhausted it. Conciliar definitions, while they cannot be simply revoked without the Church ceasing to be Christ's Church, can be complemented and reinterpreted, just as the Fifth Council has complemented and interpreted Chalcedon.

2. Doctrinal statements and definitions are made *necessary* by the life of the Church in history. One cannot avoid them for the simple reason that the human mind is constantly at work, that it constantly searches, and often errs. The function of the Church resides in giving it some guidance: the doctrinal continuity of the Orthodox Tradition is a witness of the presence in the Church of the Spirit of Truth. Thus, the Chalcedonian definition, just as all the definitions which preceded it or followed it, was not necessary in itself, but because there was a concrete danger of the Gospel of Christ being betrayed. This danger came from the heresy of Eutyches, who ceased to see in Christ a human nature totally co-substantial to us. And, in fact, such a heresy was and is present, explicitly or implicitly, in many aspects of Church life, especially in the East, and Chalcedon is a safeguard against it.

It may be that the same danger could and still can be met with other words in another fashion. Let us find it together. The principle has been admitted already in 553, and our effort to achieve unity today may be served by the experience of the Church's past.

DISCUSSION: Concerning the Paper of Father Meyendorff

PROFESSOR ROMANIDES: The impression is created that the term *One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate* became characteristic of the so-called monophysite tradition and was dropped by the Chalcedonians. In fact, it is claimed that the phrase became a basic point of contention. It should be emphasized, however, that this expression of St. Cyril, which is absolutely synonymous with his *one Hypostasis of God the Logos Incarnate*, was accepted by Flavian of Constantinople and Eusebius of Dorelaeum, as well as by the Council of Chalcedon, as is clear from the minutes. The bone of contention between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians was rather

whether after the union of natures in Christ we have *One or Two Natures*. The positions taken depended on whether *Physis* meant *Ousia* or *Hypostasis*.

Also it should be pointed out that *Hypostatic union* for St. Cyril is exactly equivalent to his own *Natural union* and both in turn are equivalent to the term *Essential union* used in the middle of the third century against Paul of Samosata and later by such contemporaries of Apollinaris as St. Gregory the Theologian. It is, therefore, not correct to speak of such a term as though it were introduced into the Church by Apollinarian forgeries.

It is also incorrect to say that Chalcedon abandoned the so-called *theopaschite formula* of St. Cyril's *Twelfth Anathema*, as Western scholars claim or that the Fifth Council brought out this implication of the hypostatic union as though the Fourth Council had not done so, as this paper indicates. Actually, Leo's *Tome* was accepted at Chalcedon only in the light of St. Cyril's *Twelve Chapters*. The so-called *theopaschite formula* is clearly contained even in Leo's *Tome*. Between Chalcedon and the Fifth Council there is no difference on the question of the Twelfth Chapter.

It is my impression that the Chalcedonian distinction between *Hypostasis* and *Physis* was much more accidental than is usually realized. Only during the later polemics was it justified by elaborate theological theories. We must always keep in mind that the Cappadocian Trinitarian distinction between *Ousia* and *Hypostasis* was accepted by the Alexandrians and applied by them to Christology. From this viewpoint talk about Chalcedon's "necessary terminological innovation" tends to ignore this very essential agreement between the Cappadocian and Alexandrian Fathers. Only against this background can one properly appreciate the different uses of the term *Physis*. Thus Chalcedon did not at all innovate, but rather accidentally adopted the Cappadocian use of *Physis* without fully understanding the Alexandrian use of the same term. To speak of any conscious attempt at Chalcedon to reconcile Antiochene and Alexandrian Christologies and terminologies is unrealistic.

Since for Cyril *Physis* and *Hypostasis* are absolutely synonymous it is not correct to claim that Cyril omitted *One Nature* from his Twelve Chapters because he preferred *One Hypostasis* or considered it the standard Christological term. In his Twelve Chapters, as well as in the rest of his Third Letter to Nestorius, Cyril uses the terms *hypostatic union* and *natural union* interchangeably.

FATHER SAMUEL: The term "monophysites" was not used during the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries, but was introduced later in a specific way and in a polemic spirit on behalf of the Chalcedonian Churches. However, one should point out that there is a slight difference between *monos* and *mia* in regard to the two natures—one nature dispute. "Monophysitism" suggests the exclusion of all natures but one. *Mia physis* refers to "one united nature." It should also be remembered that for the non-Chalcedonian side, there are four phrases, namely "from two natures," "hypostatic union," "one incarnate nature of God the Word," and "one composite nature." In fact, the term "monophysite" has been coined by isolating the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word" from the rest and substi-

tuting the word "mia" in it by "monos," a position which the non-Chalcedonian Orthodox Church has never accepted.

BISHOP SARKISSIAN: I can fully agree with the paper. What I found in it does exactly correspond to our understanding of the doctrine of the Person of Christ. However, I am surprised, and I find it extremely significant, that the *Tome of Leo* is not mentioned at all. For us, the non-Chalcedonians, the most poignant and controversial aspect of the Council of Chalcedon has been the acceptance by the Council of the *Tome of Leo* as *regula fidei*. According to our understanding, the *Tome of Leo* has had a distinctive and decisive place and role in the Council of Chalcedon. It is a highly eloquent fact that one of the staunch opponents of the Council of Chalcedon, Timothy Aelurus, in his *Refutation of the Council of Chalcedon*, which has been preserved in its integral text in an Armenian version, argues far more extensively against the *Tome of Leo* than against the Chalcedonian definition. The same has been the case in the Christological and polemical writings of the Armenian theologians.

FATHER FLOROVSKY: I am fully in agreement with Bishop Sarkissian. This was a great omission in the paper. The non-Chalcedonians fought against Chalcedon primarily on account of its acceptance of the *Tome of Leo* which in their eyes was suspicious. Indeed, the *Tome of Leo*, if taken alone by itself, could have created the impression of an excessive opposition of the two natures, especially by its persistent attribution of particular acts of Christ to different natures, without an adequate emphasis on the unity of Christ's Person, although the intention of the Pope himself was sound and orthodox. However, in the interpretation of the *Tome* by Roman Catholic historians and theologians in modern times quite often transpires a certain quasi-Nestorian bias, to which attention has been called recently by some Roman Catholic writers themselves. For that reason it is imperative, in our conversation with the non-Chalcedonians, to clarify our position and to insist on that the *Tome of Leo* should be always used in conjunction with the *horos* of the Council itself.

BISHOP SARKISSIAN: As a matter of fact, it is not only Professor Meyendorff who omitted mention of the *Tome of Leo*. The significant point is that the post-Chalcedonian Byzantine theologians did not comment on it as much as on the Chalcedonian Definition by explaining the latter along the lines of Cyrilian Christology, which brought their interpretation of Chalcedon so near to our Christological position. Is this phenomenon a testimony to the fact that the dualistic character of the *Tome's* Christology did not have any appeal to Byzantine theologians?

PROFESSOR ROMANIDES: In this regard one must keep in mind the fact that Bishop Leo of Rome and his legates presented the *Tome* to the Council of Chalcedon as a statement of faith not only against Eutyches, but against Nestorius also. Because of its obvious Nestorianizing weaknesss it was challenged, debated, carefully examined, and finally accepted only in the light of St. Cyril and again only as a statement of faith against Eutyches, as is clear from both the minutes and the very definition of Chalcedon.

FATHER MEYENDORFF: That is why I think that we should not over-emphasize the importance of the *Tome of Leo* and not regard the silence

of the Byzantine theologians as suspicious. There are many myths around the Council of Chalcedon. We have our myths about the non-Chalcedonians too, but one of your myths is this Tome.

DR. KHELLA: It is not quite a myth on our part. There are other events which prove that the Tome was carefully prepared in the West but with the special intention of securing the approval of the Eastern bishops, and their commitment to a Western formula. Marcian and Pulcheria had been gathering signatures since 450 for the Tome. The idea was to draft a strong paper against the Alexandrian theologians. This was later introduced as a basic paper at Chalcedon.

FATHER ROMANIDES: I am not aware of any historical support for your contention which seems so contrary to the fact that at Chalcedon the bishops of Illyria, Palestine, Egypt, and of the many Roman provinces represented by Anatolius of Constantinople, who all together comprised the overwhelming majority, challenged the Tome, or could accept it only in the light of St. Cyril. Leo's Tome was unconditionally supported only by the bishops of the Oriental Diocese (dioikesis) and the few delegates of Rome.

DR. KHELLA: In the Endemousa Synod of 450 in Constantinople the Tome was brought, read and approved by all present.

FATHER BOROVOVY: I see two parts in the paper of Father Meyendorff: first part, theological; second, conclusions. The second is the most substantial to my mind. I fully agree that it is possible for the Orthodox Church to reformulate her doctrines. She is not bound either by the Tome of Leo or by the Twelve Anathemas of Cyril, or even by the formulation of Cyril.

BISHOP EMILIANOS: I am fully in agreement with Father Borovoy. The Church is never enslaved by terminology which causes misinterpretations and misunderstandings.

FATHER FLOROVSKY: I am also in agreement with the last two paragraphs of the paper, but only in general. Because, on the other hand, we have to be careful not to fall into easy abstractions and generalizations. I am for apophatic theology but its use must be regulated very carefully, and we should never believe that dogmatic terminologies of the past are simply temporary formulations without continuing significance. There cannot be a fruitful discussion on dogmatical differences without careful reference to historical terminology. We are bound to use terms; through these we confess the truth, guided by the Holy Spirit in the Church. We are not imprisoned by terminologies; but we are bound by the spirit, if not the letter, of the Fathers and their understanding of Christian truth.

I do not think that our separation is due only to historical misunderstandings about the terms *physis*, *hypostasis*, *ousia*, *prosopon*, etc. These terms have taken a definite sense in the effort of the whole undivided Church to voice the one truth of the revelation of God. They used the Greek language. Well, Greek is the language of the New Testament. Everything in early Christianity is Greek. We are all Greeks in our thinking as Christians. This is not meant in a narrow nationalistic sense, but as part of our common spiritual and intellectual background. The Fathers worked out an interpretation from which we cannot simply escape. They

had to clothe the event of revelation in understandable language and categories. The difficulty was there right from the beginning, to understand fully these categories and interpret them fully in the realm of soteriology and anthropology. The special difficulty was really to interpret "hypostasis" in regard to the union of the two natures. Chalcedon emphasized the *atreplos*. This implies that in the One hypostasis of the Incarnate Logos humanity was present in its absolute completeness — *teleios anthropos*, although it was the proper humanity of the Logos. The term *physis* is used in the Chalcedonian definition precisely for the purpose to emphasize this "completeness." In fact, *atreplos* and *teleios anthropos* belong indivisibly together. Again, the "complete" human "nature" is free of sin, sin being a reduction of human nature to subhuman condition.

At this point I want to suggest a distinction which I have made already many years ago, in my Russian book, *The Byzantine Fathers*. There are, in fact, two different kinds of dyophysitism — I call them respectively: *symmetrical* and *asymmetrical*. Nestorianism is a symmetrical dyophysitism: there is strict and complete parallelism of two natures which leads inevitably to the duality of *prosopa* or subjects, which may be united only in the unity of function — this is the meaning of the Nestorian *prosopon tes henoseos*, which coordinates the two "natural" *prosopa*. The dyophysitism of Chalcedon is, on the contrary, an asymmetrical dyophysitism: there is but *one hypostasis*, as the subject of all attributions, although the distinction of Divine and human natures is carefully safeguarded. The duality of *prosopa* is emphatically rejected. The crux of the definition is precisely here: *bena kai ton auton*, "Humanity" is included in the Divine hypostasis and exists, as it were, *within this one hypostasis*. There is no symmetry: *two natures*, but *one hypostasis*. The human nature is, as it were, sustained by the Divine hypostasis: *enhypostatos*. Indeed, this *enhypostasia*, as it has been explained in the later Byzantine theology, indicates a different status of Christ's humanity in comparison with the humanity of "ordinary" men — *psiloi anthropoi*. It is humanity of the Logos. Yet, in its character it is "consubstantial" with the humanity of men. But Christ is *not a man*, although *kata ten anthropoteta* He is *homoousios hemin*. The "status" of His humanity, however, is different from ours: *choris hamartias*. This has a decisive soteriological significance: Christ was exempt from the inevitability of death, and consequently His death was a voluntary death, or free sacrifice. It would be out of place to develop this idea now any longer. But it may be helpful to say a word or two on the Christological significance of our conception of Sin, in its relation to human "nature." Again, one may distinguish two basic conceptions of man, which I use to denote as *anthropological maximalism* and *anthropological minimalism*. The obvious instances are: Pelagius, on the one hand, and Augustine, on the other. The "high" conception of man leads inevitably to *low Christology*: man needs but a pattern of perfection and example to follow. This is precisely the line of Nestorius. On the other hand, a pessimistic anthropology requires a "maximalist" Christology. In this case man needs, in the phrase of St. Gregory of Nazianzus, "God Incarnate" as his Saviour.

Here, I have to offer the solution that I suggested in a paper published

only in Russia several years ago. One has to speak of symmetrical and asymmetrical dyophysitism. The *symmetrical*, consistent with the formula true God and true man, accepts that ontologically there is an equal share of divinity and humanity in the one hypostasis of Christ, but further it accepts that there is an ontological identification of the humanity of Christ with humanity in general. This can lead to a crypto-Nestorian distinction or even separation of two persons. Well, can you say that Christ was of two hypostases? This can lead to a maximalist conception of man which can result in a maximalist conception of the incarnation.

Chalcedon was clearly for *asymmetrical* dyophysitism. The humanity of Christ is proper to the humanity that the Divine Logos fully and *atrepitos* assumed. There is, however, a certain dissimilarity between humanity in general and the humanity of Christ as the Divine Logos, because this humanity is sinless and incorruptible. You can say that Christ was free from the necessity to die. The Augustinian position seems not to pay so much attention to this dissimilarity and the monophysites risk also keeping this dissimilarity in a consistent way by slipping to the position of absolute ontological consubstantiality which denies in Christ the full qualities of humanity in general.

ARCHBISHOP TIRAN: I am fully in agreement with Father Florovsky concerning our common Greek heritage and background in theology. I have no patience with those who accuse the non-Chalcedonians of not understanding the Greek language and terminology. After all, the split over the Council of Chalcedon took place primarily among Greeks themselves and the non-Greek sections of the Church took sides with one or other Greek faction. Armenian theologians of the period under consideration spoke and wrote Greek as well as the Greeks themselves, to the degree that some sixth century Armenian writers cannot even be understood without reference to Greek grammar and vocabulary.

With regard to Father Florovsky's reference to New Testament terminology, I think we must bear in mind the fact that the Holy Scriptures could have no theological formulations that could help us in our problem. The Scriptures deal with existential situations and realities and our terms could only be interpretive of the truths conveyed by the Scriptures.

Thirdly, I am not sure that patristic anthropology has dealt sufficiently with the problem of man's nature. Some of the confusion that arose during the Christological controversies, it seems to me, was due to this fact. When the Fathers speak of the human nature of Christ, they do not seem to be clear about the nature of man himself.

FATHER SAMUEL: It is true that, as Father Florovsky has shown, a certain type of theopaschite emphasis is conserved in the Chalcedonian tradition. It should be remembered, however, that on this point the non-Chalcedonian side had led the way. In the fourth quarter of the fifth century, when under Peter the Fuller of Antioch the *Trisagion* was expanded to include the words "Thou who wast crucified for us," the Chalcedonian side opposed it. In fact, this phrase was introduced into Constantinople by Timothy of Constantinople during the days of emperor Anastasius and again there was opposition to it from the Chalcedonian side.

It was only later, by insisting on "One of the Trinity suffered," that the Chalcedonian side began to speak of God *nekroumenos*.

The non-Chalcedonian emphasis with reference to anthropology and soteriology is briefly this. Man is a created being, created by God out of nothing. But by his disobedience, he became a fallen creature. So God the Son became incarnate in order to redeem man by uniting to Himself hypostatically manhood in its fullness. This union is a mystery, which human language is incapable of describing. But we believe that the manhood so united to Himself by God the Son is preserved without diminution.

FATHER MEYENDORFF: It is clear that our difficulty lies only in interpreting *physis* and *hypostasis*. For my part, I would say that Chalcedon's main work was to distinguish between these two terms. After Chalcedon, hypostasis was used to denote a concrete reality, and a personal entity; it makes it possible to look at Christ as a composite (*synthetos*) nature in *one* hypostasis. This terminology provides the Church with a means of expressing both the duality and the concrete unity of Christ. However, since every terminology is always conventional, the Orthodox Church has not excluded the possibility of using the old, pre-Chalcedonian terminology also, provided that it conveys the same meaning. Neither the Tome of Leo, nor the Twelve Anathemas of Cyril, nor the Chalcedonian definition itself are isolated documents: they must all be considered in the light of the entire Tradition of the Church.

August 12th, 1964, Afternoon Session.

ONE INCARNATE NATURE OF GOD THE WORD

By THE REV. PROFESSOR V. C. SAMUEL

I. INTRODUCTION

The Person of Jesus Christ transcends so much our comprehension and linguistic expression that no formulation is adequate to describe Him. At the same time, the Church has adopted certain statements thereby setting a limit beyond which we should not go in our theological reflection with reference to His Person, although there is disagreement between the Chalcedonian and the non-Chalcedonian Churches on the question of what these statements are.¹ Even here the crucial difference between the two traditions of Churches may be said to lie in the attitude of each towards the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word." Thus on the whole the Western Churches are rather suspicious of this phrase. But in the East, while the Byzantine Orthodox Church is in favour of accepting it in a sort of partial way, the non-Chalcedonian Orthodox Church of the East regards it as a central linguistic tool to affirm the mystery of the Incarnation.

That the phrase came originally from Apollinarian forgeries ascribed to Athanasius of Alexandria is vigorously upheld by many modern scholars.² Even if this view be granted, it does not follow

¹ The non-Chalcedonian tradition accepts the "Nicene Creed," the Second Letter of Cyril to Nestorius, the Third Letter of Cyril to Nestorius with the Twelve Anathemas, and the Letter of Cyril to the Easterns, otherwise known as the Formulary of Reunion. It also accepts the theology of the *Henotikon* as orthodox. In the Chalcedonian tradition, many of the Western Churches are rather half-hearted in their acceptance of Cyril's Third Letter to Nestorius with the Anathemas, and no Church either in the East or in the West thinks much of the *Henotikon*. All the Chalcedonian Churches accept the *Tome of Leo* and the Chalcedonian formula of the Faith, both of which are rejected by the non-Chalcedonian body.

² For a summary treatment of this point, see R. V. Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies* (London, 1954), p. 89, esp. n. 2. Panagiotis N. Trempela, «Δογματικὴ τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας» (Athens, 1959), vol. II, p. 98. The present writer has not had a chance to examine the basis on which this view has been put forward by modern scholars. So his acceptance of it is only provisional.

that therefore the phrase should be discarded. For the crucial phrase in the Nicene Creed, namely "of the same substance with the Father" (*ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ* or *shewa bousia labo*), had not only a pagan origin,³ but it had also been condemned by the Council of Antioch in 268 which excommunicated Paul of Samosata.⁴ Therefore, the unorthodox origin of a term cannot be cited as an argument against its adoption by Orthodox theology, so long as the meaning assigned to it is orthodox and there is need for pressing that meaning. Cyril of Alexandria, the great bulwark of orthodoxy against the teaching of the Nestorian school in the fifth century,⁵ saw in the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word" a most crucial linguistic tool to conserve the Church's faith in the Person of Jesus Christ.

However, like the Nicene phrase "of the same substance with the Father" which came to be misunderstood and misconstrued by various men for a long time, the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word" also was given different shades of erroneous meanings by men in olden times. Before taking up these heretical ideas for a brief discussion, it is necessary to look into the question of Eutyches.

II. THE TEACHING OF EUTYCHES

The question as to what precisely were the ideas held by Eutyches is not easy to be answered. Two sets of statements made by him at the Home Synod of Constantinople in 448 are certainly to be considered confused, if not heretical.⁶ Thus in the first place, when he was asked whether he would affirm that our Lord was "of the same substance with us" (*ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν* or *Shewa bousia lan*), he answered in this way: "Since I confess my God to be the Lord of heaven and earth, I have not till this day let myself en-

³ G. L. Prestige has shown in his *God in Patristic Thought* (London, 1952), p. 197, that Valentinians had used the phrase "homoousios."

⁴ In defending the Council of Nicea, both Athanasius and Hilary of Poitiers acknowledge this fact and proceed to answer the problem derived from it.

⁵ The fact that there are a number of modern scholars who are critical of Cyril's theology should be noted here. But to the present writer they seem to misread the theology of Cyril in their enthusiasm to defend the theology of the Antiochene school.

⁶ All the statements of Eutyches referred to here are noted in Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. vi, 696-753, and E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*, II, i, pp. 122-147.

quire into His nature. That He is of the same substance with us, I have not affirmed till now, I confess." Again, "Till this day I have not said concerning the body of the Lord that it is of the same substance with us. But the Virgin is of the same substance with us, I confess." When, however, he was pressed as to how, if the mother was of the same substance with us, the Son could be otherwise, Eutyches said: "As you say now, I agree in every thing." It is clear from these statements that Eutyches was hesitant to affirm that our Lord was of the same substance with us.

Secondly, to the question of whether he would affirm that our Lord was two natures after the union, he answered: "I confess our Lord to be of two natures before the union, but after the union I confess one nature." (διμολογῶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων γεγενῆσθαι τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν πρὸ τῆς ἔνώσεως, μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἔνωσιν μία φύσις διμολογῶ.)

Pushing these two statements to their logical conclusion, it is possible to read into Eutyches a position like this. Before God the Son became incarnate and Godhead and manhood were united in Jesus Christ, He was "of two natures."⁷ When, however, the natures were united, He came to be "one nature." Since as Eutyches was reluctant to affirm that Christ was of the same substance with us, the expression "one nature" may well have meant for him that the manhood was lost, as it were, subsequent to the union.

It is this meaning that the *Tome of Leo*, some Bishops at Chalcedon, and the Chalcedonian Formula of the Faith have seen in Eutyches. The *Tome of Leo*, for instance, has made out that "using deceptive words," Eutyches said that "the Word was made Flesh in such wise as to imply that Christ having been conceived in the Virgin's womb, possessed the form of a man without a real body taken from His mother."⁸ At Chalcedon Basil of Seleucia reported that for Eutyches a mere affirmation that God the Word became man by the assumption of flesh was enough to conserve the faith. (ῶστε εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν τὸν τρόπον τῆς σαρκώσεως καὶ ἔνανθωτήσεως εἰ κατὰ πρόσληψιν σαρκὸς οἴδε τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον γενόμενον ἀνθρωπὸν.) The Chalcedonian Formula, referring in all probability to Eutyches, states that "others introduce a confusion and mixture,

⁷ Unless we ascribe to Eutyches an Origenist Christology, this statement of Eutyches makes no sense. To read that into him is to make of him a thinker of eminence which he certainly was not.

⁸ See T. H. Bindley, *The Ecumenical Documents of the Faith*, Methuen (London, 1950), pp. 224-231. For the Greek passage below see Mansi vi 633 B, and ACO. II, i, p. 92: 164-166.

shamelessly imagining the Nature of the flesh and of the God-head to be one, and absurdly maintaining that the Divine Nature of the Only-begotten is by this confusion possible"; and that the Council "anathematizes those who imagine Two Natures of the Lord before the Union, but fashion anew One Nature after the Union."⁹

But there are other statements of Eutyches in which he shows that this is not his position. So in an oral statement made by him at the Home Synod of Constantinople he said: "Concerning His coming in the flesh, I confess that it happened from the flesh of the Virgin, and that He became man perfectly (*τελείως*) for our salvation." By this statement Eutyches did affirm a real incarnation. He made the same point still clearer in this confession of the faith. "For He Himself," affirmed Eutyches, "who is the Word of God, descended from heaven without flesh, was made flesh of the very flesh of the Virgin unchangeably and inconvertibly in a way which He Himself knew and willed. And He who is always perfect God before the ages, the Same also was made perfect man for us and for our salvation."¹⁰ This statement was certainly not unorthodox, insufficient though we may judge it to conserve the Church's faith fully. So we have to say with J. N. D. Kelly, "The traditional picture of Eutyches, it is clear, has been formed by picking out certain of his statements and pressing them to their logical conclusion. . . . He was not a docetist or Apollinarian, nothing could have been more explicit than his affirmation of the reality and completeness of the manhood . . ."¹¹

In any case, from the point of view of initiating a discussion of the issue which separates the Chalcedonian Church from the non-Chalcedonian Church, the question of whether Eutyches himself had, in fact, held the view ascribed to him by the *Tome of Leo* and the Chalcedonian Formula is not important. What is important, on the other hand, is the question as to whether the non-Chalcedonian Church has ever held the ideas thus ascribed to Eutyches. On this question the answer is quite clear. For Dioscorus of Alexandria did himself express this rejection of the ideas

⁹ T. H. Bindley, *op. cit.*, pp. 232, 235.

¹⁰ For the confession of Eutyches, see G. Hahn, *Bibliothek der symbole und glaubensregeln der alten kirche* (Breslau, 1897), pp. 319-320, and Mansi, *op. cit.*, v 1016 C.

¹¹ J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (Adam and Charles Black, London, 1958), pp. 332-333.

read into Eutyches at Chalcedon.¹² Following him, the non-Chalcedonian Church has, throughout the centuries condemned these ideas¹³ and even the person of Eutyches.

III. THE ERRONEOUS IDEAS ASSIGNED TO THE PHRASE "ONE INCARNATE NATURE OF GOD THE WORD"

Broadly speaking, these ideas may be classified under three heads. We will mention them one by one.

1. A Tendency to Ignore the Manhood of Christ

This, as we have seen, is the position ascribed to Eutyches. Whether he himself held it or not, there were men in olden times who maintained this view. Such men were called "Eutychianists." A certain John the rhetorician of Alexandria is reported to have taught "Eutychianism" during the decade after the Council of Chalcedon.¹⁴

According to Zacharia, John the rhetorician was a student of philosophy, who tried to combine some ideas derived from the Christian faith with his rational speculation. So he maintained that Jesus Christ was God the Word, who came into the world, being born of a virgin without conjugal relation. Being born in this way, He cannot have been fully man. So He was "one nature" in the sense that He was God, but not also man.

2. A Teaching Which Ignores Human Properties in Jesus Christ.

A more subtle position than the foregoing one, this emphasis may be illustrated by referring to Sergius the Grammarian. A correspondent of Severus of Antioch in the sixth century, Sergius expressed it in this way: "Godhead and the flesh are two *ousias*. Eternality is the property of the former and corruptibility that of the latter." In becoming man, God the Son assumed flesh which "was born supernaturally," and the flesh "did not see corruption." But "by reason of the union the human property was passed over."

¹² See Mansi vi 633C, and *ACO*. II, i, p. 92: 168.

¹³ "Eutychianism" was opposed by the non-Chalcedonian body from the very beginning. Thus we have evidence that Theodosius of Jerusalem, who led the movement against Chalcedon in Palestine soon after the Council, and Timothy Aelurus of Alexandria condemned men who held it.

¹⁴ See Zacharia Rhetor, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, I (Syriac), pp. 163-164.

Therefore, "it is better to say that there was one property" only in Christ.¹⁵

We find here an emphasis, which takes Godhead and manhood as two different *ousias*, each possessing its own property. But they were united in Christ in such a way that the human properties came to be lost in the union. Those who taught this idea took the phrase "one incarnate nature" as a convenient linguistic tool to conserve it.

It may be useful in this context to refer to the misunderstanding of the non-Chalcedonian position expressed by men of the Chalcedonian side in ancient times. John the Grammarian is referred to by Severus of Antioch to have criticized the non-Chalcedonian position as having maintained that "the Godhead and the flesh of Christ constituted one *ousia* and one nature."¹⁶ The argument of the Grammarian may be put in this way: The non-Chalcedonian leaders were insisting that Christ was one incarnate nature, and that He was not two natures after the union. But the very emphasis that Christ was of the same substance with the Father as to Godhead and of the same substance with us as to manhood should be taken as an adequate basis for saying that He was in two natures. The non-Chalcedonian leaders were, however, opposed to the phrase "in two natures." This must be because in their view Christ was one *ousia*. In other words, the opponents of Chalcedon were considered unwilling to affirm the reality of Christ's manhood.

The answer of the non-Chalcedonian leaders to this criticism we shall see in a moment. What we should note in the present context is the fact that their position was very much misunderstood and even misinterpreted by men of the Chalcedonian side in olden times.

3. A Teaching Which Maintains That the Manhood of Christ Was Incorruptible.

This position was held by Julian of Halicarnassus. In fact, it

¹⁵ See *Ad Nephaliūm*, ed. J. Lebon (Louvain, 1949), (Syriac), pp. 71-72.

¹⁶ John the Grammarian was a critic of the non-Chalcedonian position, whose work in defense of Chalcedon was refuted by Severus in his *Liber contra impium grammaticum*. For this criticism of his, see *ibid.* ed. J. Lebon (Louvain, 1952), I (Syriac), p. 20.

had adherents in both the Chalcedonian and the non-Chalcedonian bodies in ancient times. Justinian himself adopted a form of it towards the end of his life, and Justinian was a persecutor of the non-Chalcedonian body.

The teaching of Julian may be summarized in this way.¹⁷ God created man in the beginning essentially immortal and incorruptible. But by the sin of Adam and the consequent fall, he lost this essential property. In order to save man from this fallen state, God the Son became incarnate by uniting to Himself real and perfect manhood. But the manhood which He thus assumed was so sinless that it was the manhood of Adam before the fall, and so it was essentially impassible, immortal and incorruptible. Julian, however, maintained that Christ suffered passions and died on the cross voluntarily for us. At the same time, he insisted that the body of our Lord was from the moment of its formation in the womb of the Virgin incorruptible.

Of the many ideas which Julian emphasized, some are orthodox while others are heretical. Thus the following orthodox ideas in the teaching of Julian may be noted: (a) God the Son became incarnate by uniting to Himself real and perfect manhood. (b) As man, Christ was absolutely sinless. (c) The suffering and death which Christ endured were indispensable for our salvation, and God the Son Himself assumed them as His own.

But the following ideas of Julian seem heretical: (a) When God the Son became incarnate, He united to Himself the manhood of Adam before the fall. So it was essentially impassible and immortal. (b) The body of our Lord was incorruptible, not merely after the resurrection, but from the moment of its conception in the womb of the Virgin. (c) As man, Christ was of the same substance with us, not in the sense that His manhood was our manhood, but only in the sense that it was the essential manhood of Adam before the fall. In other words, according to Julian, the manhood was not only sinless, but it had no involvement in the fallen state of the human race.

¹⁷ This discussion of Julian's teaching is based on a study of the writings of Severus of Antioch against Julian. For the early letters exchanged between them, see *Zacharia, op. cit.*, II, pp. 102-112, and for other writings, see *Severi Antijulianistica*, A. Sanday (Beyrouth, 1931) and British Museum M.S. No. 12158.

IV. THE NON-CHALCEDONIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH IN THE FACE OF THESE ERRONEOUS EMPHASES

These three positions were, in fact, not only rejected but even refuted by the leaders of the non-Chalcedonian Orthodox Church. As we have already noted, John the rhetorician lived during the decade after the Council of Chalcedon. Theodosius of Jerusalem, who led the movement against Chalcedon in Palestine soon after the Council, opposed his teaching and even wrote a treatise refuting it.¹⁸ It is reported that he took strong measures against other "Eutychianists" in Palestine also. Timothy Aelurus, the immediate successor of Dioscorus on the See of Alexandria, was equally opposed to "Eutychianism." During his exile in Gangara Bishop Isiah of Hermopolis and Presbyter Theophilus of Alexandria left Egypt and made their home in Constantinople, where they disseminated "Eutychianist" ideas. On hearing this news, Timothy sent letters opposing them and in the end he excommunicated them.¹⁹ Thus from the point of view of condemning "Eutychianists" and their ideas, there is no ground for doubt that the non-Chalcedonian Church has done it with as much vigour as the Chalcedonian Church. We can, in fact, say that the ancient Orthodox Church of the East which renounced the Council of Chalcedon has, from the beginning, excluded also the heresies which the Council has condemned.

The second and the third erroneous positions noted above came to be expressed during the days of Severus of Antioch. He refuted them, and, under his leadership, his section of the Church also excluded them categorically.

As we have noted, it was Sergius the Grammarian who expressed the second position. Severus answered him by saying that the affirmation of a difference of properties was the teaching of the fathers. The natures which were united in the one Christ, they affirmed, were different. "For one is uncreated, and the other is created." But while "the difference in properties of the natures" continued to be real, "the natures of which the one Christ is, are united without confusion." In this way, "the Word of life is said

¹⁸ See Zacharia, *op. cit.*, pp. 161-164.

¹⁹ For this incident and the letters which Timothy Aelurus wrote in this connection, see Zacharia, *ibid.*, pp. 185-205, and 215-216. That Timothy Aelurus opposed "Eutychianists" is mentioned even by Evagrius. See P.G. LXXXVI 2603 A.

to have become visible and tangible." When we think of the Emmanuel, we shall see that Godhead and manhood are different, and as we confess the union, "the difference signifying the natures of which the one Christ is" we do not ignore, "though by reason of the *hypostatic union*" we discard division.²⁰ In fact, it is on the ground of this admission that Severus works out his emphasis on the *communicatio idiomatum*. For he maintains that there is an exchange of properties in Christ, so that "the Word may be recognized in the properties of the flesh," and the human properties have "come to belong to the Word and the properties of the Word to the flesh."²¹ A passage from the work of Severus against John the Grammarian may be quoted here to show how he maintains a recognition of the principle of difference in the one Christ.²²

"Those, therefore, who confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is one (made up) of Godhead and manhood, and that He is one *prosopon*, one *hypostasis*, and one nature of the Word incarnate, recognize and affirm also the difference, integrity, and otherness of the natures, of which the one Christ is ineffably formed. As they perceive this by subtle thought and contemplation of the mind, they do not take it as a ground for dividing the Emmanuel into two natures after the union."

That in maintaining this point of view Severus was not adopting a position discontinuous with the non-Chalcedonian leaders before him may be shown. As we know, the Formula of Chalcedon contains four adverbs with reference to the union of the natures in Christ, and they are ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως and ἀχωρίστως (without confusion, change, division and separation). The Formula was adopted at Chalcedon on 22nd October 451. But on 8th October, fourteen days before this incident, Dioscorus stated at Chalcedon that in opposing the phrase "two natures after the union" or its cognate "*in* two natures," he was not speaking of confusion, division, change, or mixture (οὐτε σύγχυσιν λέγομεν, οὐτε τομήν. ἀνάθεμα τῷ λέγοντι ἡ σύγχροσιν ἡ τροπὴν ἡ ἀνάκροσιν).²³ Another equally important statement of Dioscorus made at Chalcedon should also be noted here. On one occasion he signified

²⁰ *Ad Nephelium*, *op. cit.*, pp. 74-77.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

²² *Contr. Gr.*, *op. cit.*, III, p. 106.

²³ Mansi VI 676D-677A; *ACO*. II, i, p. 112: 262-263.

that he was in agreement with the affirmation "of two natures after the union."²⁴ These evidences are sufficient to say that in protesting against the Council of Chalcedon, Dioscorus was not showing any sympathy for a theological position which ignored the manhood of our Lord.

All the non-Chalcedonian leaders have affirmed that in His Incarnation God the Son united to Himself manhood animated with a rational soul and of the same substance with us, that He endured in reality blameless passions of the body and the soul, and that there was no confusion or mixture of the natures in Him. Taking these emphases seriously, if we evaluate their teaching, we shall certainly see that in opposing the Council of Chalcedon they were not led by any sympathy for "Eutychianism" or monophysitism of any kind. We shall also realize that they had not interpreted the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word" to mean absorption of the manhood or the human property.

Severus answered also the charge of John the Grammarian that the non-Chalcedonian body was arguing, on the basis of the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word," that in Christ Godhead and manhood formed one *ousia*. In fact, he challenged the critic to show at least a single bit of evidence to prove his charge and made it very clear that his section of the Church did not hold that view.²⁵ This means that for Severus and the Church which he represented "one incarnate nature" did not mean "one *ousia*."

Julian of Halicarnassus was refuted by Severus. Relying on the work of R. Draguet, *Julien d'Halicarnasse et sa controverse avec Sévère d'Antioche sur l'incorruptibilité du corps du Christ* (Louvain, 1924), R. V. Sellers maintains that the difference between the teaching of Severus and that of Julian is largely one of terminology.²⁶ The present writer finds it difficult to agree with this reading of the difference between Severus and Julian.²⁷ Even granting that this reading is correct, would the Chalcedonian side maintain a position more adequate than the one held by Severus?

²⁴ Mansi vi 692A; *ACO*. ii, i, p. 120: 332.

²⁵ For this discussion of Severus, see his *Contr. Gr., op. cit.*, i, pp.20-24.

²⁶ R. V. Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon* (S.P.C.K., 1953), pp. 309-310, note 6.

²⁷ For our reading of the difference between the two men, see above pp. 42-43.

**V. SEVERUS ON "ONE INCARNATE NATURE
OF GOD THE WORD"**

Following Cyril of Alexandria, Severus accepts four phrases with reference to the Incarnation. They are: "of (*ἐν*) two natures," "*hypostatic union*," "one incarnate nature of God the Word," and "one composite nature." In his view all these phrases stand together. So in order to understand what the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word" means to him and to the Church which he represents the meaning of these phrases should be noted.

The crucial word in these phrases is "nature" (*φύσις* or *kyono*). As to its meaning, both Severus and the Chalcedonian writers of his time agree that it may be taken either in the sense of *ousia* or in that of *hypostasis*. Severus shows that *ousia* stands for him both as an equivalent of the *eidos* of Plato and as a generic term including all the members of a class. By *hypostasis* (*ὑπόστασις* or *qnumo*) Severus means a concrete particular in which the *ousia* (*οὐσία* or *ousio* [Syr.]) is individuated. In other words, for both sides "nature" means either the dynamic reality existing in the realm of ideas or the concrete object resulting from its individuation. But they disagree on the application of the word "nature" to the Person of Christ. Whereas the Grammarian takes it in the sense of *ousia*, Severus sees in it the meaning of *hypostasis*.²⁸

Coming now to the phrases themselves, Severus makes it clear that Christ was "of (*ἐν*) two natures." But by this phrase he does not sanction the expression "two natures before the union."²⁹ He says that "no one who has thought correctly has ever affirmed" this phrase "even in fancy."³⁰ For the "*Hypostasis* of God the Word existed . . . before all the ages and times, He being eternally with God the Father and the Holy Spirit"; but "the flesh possessing a rational soul did not exist before the union with him."³¹ The phrase "of (*ἐν*) two natures" means, for Severus, two ideas. On the one hand, it conserves the emphasis that in Christ there was a union of God the Son with an individuated manhood, and on the

²⁸ Severus himself discusses the meaning of the crucial terms both in his *Contra Grammaticum* and in some of his doctrinal letters.

²⁹ He opposes "two natures before the union" in several places in his writings.

³⁰ *Contr. Gram.*, II, p. 239.

³¹ *Patrologia Orientalis*, XII, pp. 190-191.

other that Christ was unceasingly a continuation of that union. So Christ was always "of (*ἐν*) two natures"; and thus He was at once perfect God and perfect man being "of the same substance with God the Father" and "of the same substance with us."

The union of the natures was *hypostatic*, by which Severus means that "it was in union with the Word who is before the ages that the flesh was formed and came *to be*, and in concurrence it [namely the flesh] received with Him concreteness into the union. In this way, from two, namely Godhead and manhood, Christ is known indivisibly one Emmanuel."³²

The phrase "*hypostatic* union," then, means for Severus that in Christ there was a coming together of everything that the Godhead of the Son implies and of everything that an individuated manhood connotes. The phrase means also the absolutely inward and personal character of the union.

In a long passage in his *Philalethes*, Severus discusses the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word." When the fathers spoke of "one incarnate nature of God the Word," he writes, "they made it clear that the Word did not abandon His nature"; neither did He undergo any "loss or diminution in His *hypostasis*. When they affirmed that "He became incarnate" they made it clear that "the flesh was nothing but flesh, and that it did not come into being by itself apart from the union with the Word." Again the words "became incarnate" refer to the Word's assumption of the flesh from the Virgin, an assumption by which from two natures, namely Godhead and manhood, one Christ came forth from Mary." He is at once God and man, being of the same substance with the Father as to Godhead and of the same substance with us as to manhood.³³

There are three emphases made by the phrase "one incarnate nature." (1) It was God the Son Himself who became incarnate. (2) In becoming incarnate, He individuated manhood in union with Himself and made it His very own. (3) The incarnate Word is one Person.

The "one" in the phrase "one incarnate nature" is not a *simple one*, so that the characterization "monophysite" cannot be considered applicable to the position of Severus. As "one incarnate

³² This is a passage taken from *Contr. Gram.*, II, pp. 239-241.

³³ See *Philalethes*, ed. Robert Hespel (Louvain, 1952) (Syriac), p. 139.

nature," Jesus Christ is one *composite* nature. In the Incarnation, by a divine act of condescension, God the Son willed to be so united with manhood that the two of them came together, without either of them being lost or diminished. At the same time, their union was so real and perfect that Christ was "one composite nature."

In the face of the misunderstanding expressed by the Chalcedonian tradition that the non-Chalcedonian position has ignored the manhood of Christ, we shall put together the ideas emphasized by Severus on this point.

(1) Christ's manhood was an individuated manhood, fully like and continuous with our manhood, with the single exception that it was absolutely sinless. (2) The manhood of Christ was individuated only in a *hypostatic* union with God the Son, and it continued to exist in perfection and reality in that union. Therefore, the manhood of Christ did not exist independent of its union with God the Son. (3) The union did not lead to a confusion of the manhood with, or a loss in, the Godhead; and therefore in Christ there were Godhead and manhood with their respective properties *hypostatically* united with each other. But the two should not be separated. (4) The Union brought into being one Person, and this one Person is the Person of God the Son in His incarnate state. There is a distinction between the pre-incarnate Son and the incarnate Son, so that the *Hypostasis* and *Prosopon* of Jesus Christ are not simply the *Hypostasis* and the *Prosopon* of God the Son. (5) The manhood of Christ was real, perfect, and dynamic in the union.

Having made all these emphases, why did Severus and the leaders of the non-Chalcedonian Church refuse to accept the phrase "in two natures?" In fact, both in his letters to Nephalius and in his *Liber Contra Impium Grammaticum*, Severus admits that some earlier fathers had spoken of Christ that He was two natures. These fathers, insists Severus, meant by the expression only that Christ was at once God and man. However, the Nestorian school adopted the phrase to assert a doctrine of two persons. The phrase should not, therefore, be used any longer. Severus says also that

"When we anathematize those who affirm of the Emmanuel two natures after the union and their operations as well as properties, it is not for speaking of natures or operations or properties that we place them under condemnation;

but for saying two natures after the union and assigning the operations and properties to each of them, thereby dividing them between the natures.”⁸⁴

The passage is clear enough. Christ is “of two natures, the properties and operations of each of which are there in Him in a state of indivisible and indissoluble union. To illustrate the point, men saw Christ hunger or thirst or suffer physical and mental agony. It is right on their part to say on the ground of what they saw that Christ’s manhood was the subject of these experiences. So also men saw Him heal the sick and raise the dead. It is correct again to say that the Godhead of Christ did these signs. But in Christ the hunger and all other physical disabilities were human, united with, and made His own by God the Son in His incarnate state. In the same way, the super-human words and deeds were expressions of the Godhead of the Son in union with manhood. In other words, it was the one incarnate Person who was the subject of all the words and deeds of Christ. This one incarnate Person was the “one incarnate nature of God the Word” or the “one composite nature” of the incarnate Son. When we reflect on Him, we can, in our contemplation, distinguish the two natures of Godhead and manhood and their respective properties and operations.

But the *Tome of Leo* went beyond this sound principle, and in declaring it a document of the faith the Council of Chalcedon also committed a great error. According to the *Tome*, “Each nature performs what is proper to it in communion with the other; the Word, for instance, performing what is proper to the Word, and the flesh carrying out what is proper to the flesh.” A teaching of this kind does not affirm Christ’s personal unity, but regards the natures as two persons. The phrase “in two natures” defined by the Council of Chalcedon must have meant the same teaching as that of Bishop Leo. So it cannot be accepted.

VI. THE REAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE CHALCEDONIAN AND THE NON-CHALCEDONIAN POSITIONS

As we have noted, the Chalcedonian East accepts the orthodoxy of the phrase “one incarnate nature of God the Word.” It believes that it is even necessary to maintain this phrase as a safeguard against Nestorianism. But it adds that since the phrase can

⁸⁴ *Ad Nephaliūm*, p. 80.

be taken in a misleading sense, the expression "in two natures" should also be added to it. Thus by "in two natures" Eutychianism can be excluded, and by "one incarnate nature" Nestorianism may be kept out.

The non-Chalcedonian Church, on the other hand, maintains that these two phrases contradict each other in meaning, and that in the light of the theology of the *Tome of Leo* "in two natures" cannot have meant for the Council of Chalcedon anything more than the teaching of Nestorius. As for excluding "Eutychianism," it can be done by insisting on the phrase "of two natures" and by emphasizing that the "one incarnate nature" is "one composite nature." The real terminological difference between the two traditions can thus be seen to lie in the two prepositions of "in" (*ἐν*) and "of" (*ἐν*).

A WORD IN CONCLUSION

It is quite clear that neither Dioscorus of Alexandria nor the non-Chalcedonian Orthodox Church took the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word" in order to ignore, or minimize the importance of, Christ's manhood. But they considered it crucial because it was the phrase by which they affirmed the indivisible unity of the Person of Christ. In fact, while opposing the Council of Chalcedon with reference to its positive affirmation of the faith which they believed was Nestorianism in disguise, they excluded the heresies which the Council had condemned.

Post Script

In the light of the questions raised during the discussion following the reading of this paper, the writer wishes to suggest these changes in the text with a view to bringing out the intended meaning more clearly.

1. Page 43, last three lines may be changed to: "In other words, according to Julian, the manhood of Christ was not only sinless, but was also without a real relation with the fallen human race."

2. Page 49, line 21 may be changed to: "The union resulted in the concurrence of Godhead and manhood into one Person (*hypostasis*) and this one Person . . ."

3. Page 50, lines 8-10 may be changed to: ". . . suffer physical and mental agony, and they may say on the ground of what they saw that it was Christ's manhood which underwent these experiences."

DISCUSSION: Concerning the Paper of Father Samuel

FATHER ROMANIDES: I was very much impressed by the precision and Orthodoxy of this paper. On the basis of this exposition, I cannot see where we differ on essentials. To make myself clear, I would point out that the term *One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate* was accepted by Flavian and Eusebius, although there is strong evidence that they did not understand the exact sense in which Cyril used this phrase. We see this from Flavian's confession of faith of 449 and in the case of both Flavian and Eusebius from the minutes of Ephesus 449 and Chalcedon. The phrase was taken for granted at Chalcedon as equivalent to Cyril's other way of saying the same, *viz.*, *One Hypostasis of God the Logos Incarnate*.

On the basis of Father Samuel's paper, I would like to ask our non-Chalcedonian brothers whether they would accept (1) the phrase *One Physis Composite* as equivalent to *One Ousia Composite*, and (2) *From Two Physeis* as equivalent to *From Two Ousiae*. For Chalcedonians both phrases are unacceptable when *physis* means *ousia* since they would then mean *one ousia in Christ after the union*. When we speak of *In Two Natures* we mean *In Two Ousiae*. Of course, the term is of Latin provenance, but as an anti-Eutychianist statement it should be considered adequate and should not be pressed for philosophical consequences according to this or that school of thought. It is accepted by us only as a statement of faith in the *double consubstantiality* of Christ and nothing more. When *physis* is synonymous with *hypostasis*, as in the theology of St. Cyril, then the terms *From Two Natures*, *One Nature Composite*, and *One Nature After the Union* are not only acceptable, but obviously necessary. Within the context of strict Cyrilian terminology *In Two Natures* would, of course, be impossible. Yet *In Two Ousiae* would be possible.

The teaching of Julian of Halicarnassus that the Logos united to Himself manhood as it was before the fall is not in itself wrong and is accepted by all Fathers. What is wrong with Julian's position, as pointed out by Father Samuel, is that the human nature of Christ was considered incorruptible before the resurrection. I would add that most Fathers would rather say that the human nature of Christ was by nature mortal but not by nature under the power or sentence of death and corruption which are the wages of sin. In this sense even angels are by nature mortal. Only God is by nature immortal. It is for this reason that the death of the Lord of Glory in the flesh was voluntary and not the wages of personal or inherited sin.

Two sentences in the paper seem to me to contradict the position which the paper is trying to defend. They are: (1) p. 50. "It is right on their part to say on the ground of what they saw that Christ's manhood was the subject of these experiences," an echo of Leo's Tome, and p. 49 "the union brought into being one Person," which reminds one of the Nestorian Person brought into being by the union of natures.

FATHER SAMUEL: The first sentence refers only to what men saw in Christ and thought about Him. But in Christ these experiences were ex-

periences of God the Son incarnate. Therefore, no contradiction is implied by it.

The second sentence is based on the emphasis of Severus that there was a distinction between the pre-incarnate Son and the incarnate Son. On the strength of this emphasis Severus shows that the *hypostasis* of Jesus Christ, though it is continuous with the hypostasis of God the Son, is not simply the latter. The *hypostasis* of Jesus Christ is a composite *hypostasis* formed by the concurrence of Godhead and manhood. The second sentence aims only to make this point.

FATHER MEYENDORFF: When we refer to Christ as "One incarnate nature of God the Word" we mean that He is one *hypostasis*. We also accept the phrase "from two natures." But in these phrases the word "nature" means *ousia*.

FATHER ROMANIDES: "From two natures" is used as equivalent to "From two *ousiai*" by Flavian of Constantinople, but never by Cyril and the Alexandrians. The definition of the Fifth Ecumenical Council clearly accepts "From two natures" according to the Cyrillian usage also which speaks of "one nature" in Christ, but not "one *ousia*." Thus we of the Chalcedonian tradition are free to use the term "from two natures" in both the Flavian and Cyrillian sense, but never according to the Eutychian equation of "nature" and "*ousia*."

FATHER FLOROVSKY: The statement on page 49 that the manhood of Christ was absolutely sinless is not enough. We must also say that Christ was free from original sin.

August 12th, 1964, Evening Session.

THE RECIPROCAL RELATION BETWEEN DOCTRINAL AND HISTORICAL FACTORS IN THE SEPARATION OF THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES FROM THE ANCIENT CATHOLIC CHURCH

By PROFESSOR G. KONIDARIS

The consideration of the historical circumstances of the separation of the Oriental churches from the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church in the 5th century is the best possible starting-point for the conversations between our separate churches and theologies which have been taken up within the realm of the ecumenical movement. For the knowledge of the historical background of the separation forms the indispensable presupposition for our studies.

With this I would like to express my agreement with the suggestion of the preparatory committee for an unofficial theological consultation between the Oriental churches and the Catholic-Orthodox Church. The view that many theological questions appear in another light when they are put in the proper historical context, should be modified in the sense that the separation can only be clarified and interpreted through historical investigation. Also the discussion of the theme, "how the statement of Cyril of Alexandria on the doctrine of the two natures of Christ must be interpreted today, *mia physis tou Theou Logou sesarkomene*," is basically a debate about a theme of the history of doctrine. Also the scientific, dogmatic presuppositions of our question are historical questions, for they are valid for the clarification not only of the historical situation, but also of the christology of the ancient church from the earliest times until the 4th Ecumenical Council (451).

The best method in my opinion is to follow the observation of the eminent Byzantinist Vasiliev which leads back to the historical background. He was of the opinion that the dogmatic decisions of the 4th Ecumenical Council at Chalcedon had a great political importance for Byzantine history. He was, however, also of

the opinion that the government of Byzantium, in its official reaction against the Monophysitism of the 5th century, led to its estrangement from the Eastern provinces of Syria, Palestine and Egypt, where the majority of the inhabitants were Monophysites. The Monophysites held fast to their dogmatic convictions, even after the condemnation by the 4th Ecumenical Council and would accept no compromise (451). The church of Egypt, by which he evidently means the indigenous congregations, had done away with the Greek liturgy and introduced the Coptic in its place. The religious anomaly in Jerusalem, Alexandria and Antioch, called into being by the forcible execution of the decisions of Chalcedon, developed in the form of national revolutions which were overcome and suppressed only after bloody battles.

The overcoming of the revolutionary crisis did not, however, solve the basic question of the time. For behind the religious differences, which increased in intensity with time, appeared intensive racial and cultural differences, mainly in Syria and Egypt. The non-Greek inhabitants of Egypt and Syria gradually came to the conviction that they must separate themselves from the Byzantine Empire. Vasiliev is of the opinion (S. 138) that religious disturbances in the Eastern provinces, which were strengthened by the structures of the population of these areas, created the situations and conditions in the 7th century which led to the surrender of the rich and cultivated provinces of the Orient into the hands, first of the Persians and then of the Arabs. The question whether this last view can be substantiated from the sources is one which we cannot, and do not wish to investigate here. The important thing is, however, that Nestorianism attained greater influence in the Orient, above all in Persia, and that according to Ostrogorsky's view "the opposition between the Byzantine Church with its doctrine of the two natures, and the Monophysite church of the Christian Orient became, from then on, the most urgent problem of ecclesiastical and national politics in the early Byzantine Empire." Monophysitism served as an expression also of the political as well as the religious separation of Egypt and Syria. It became the watch-word (or slogan) of Coptic and Syrian separatism in the struggle against Byzantine domination (S. 50). The Monophysitism condemned by Chalcedon won ever greater power in the Eastern world; in consequence, the dissension between the heart-lands of the Empire and its Eastern provinces became even sharper.

The political importance of the ecclesiastical question for the unity, economy and peace of the Empire and above all, of the Eastern border provinces and the military measures which the Empire had to adopt in order to strengthen and maintain the orthodox faith, led, for example, to new military measures in Alexandria with a view to the excommunication of the Monophysite, Timotheos Aeluros. Bloody battles were the result. The native population and the monks were Monophysites who removed Proterios, the Orthodox patriarch and pope of Alexandria — who had been elected by the 4th Ecumenical Council — from his throne. Chrysostomos Papadopoulos has said that the 28th of March, 475, was the saddest day in the history of the church of Alexandria. For on that day the Monophysite rabble stormed the palace Kaissarion and killed Proterios, although he had taken refuge in the baptistery of the church. His body was brought in triumph by the masses into the arena and burned (Theod. Anagn. P.G. 86, 169, Theoph. S. 110-111). The churches of the Orient also were indignant with the Monophysites, and the question of re-establishment of the peace and unity of the Empire in the border regions became ever acuter. The emperor entered the lists in favour of carrying out the dogmatic decisions of Chalcedon. He was orthodox. Marcian was under no illusions as to the danger that the border regions of Syria and Palestine could be lost. In the long run they could not be held. Perhaps only through a formula of compromise could the three areas be saved from the hands of the native revolutionary populace. This, then, had to be the aim also of the policies of the Empire. The compromise between Orthodoxy and Monophysitism was, however, possible only politically and not theologically. The policy was worked out in terms of expediency and advantage, and recognized no obligation to theological principle; in consequence, it could find the most suitable formulas and carry them into effect by means of the heavy hand of the state. The church, however, was bound to Scripture, to tradition and to the dogmas accepted by the three first ecumenical councils in their essential consistency. Therefore a policy which did not take seriously the question of truth in relation to the dogmas, i.e. to orthodoxy, or in some way disputed it, was impossible for the catholic church. The depreciation of the validity and ecumenicity of the 4th Ecumenical Council could not be maintained in the long run.

The Emperor Leo (457) asked the bishops, through a circular letter, whether they would acknowledge the 4th Ecumenical Coun-

cil, and what view they took of Timotheos Aeluros, who was active as the first patriarch of the Coptic Church of Alexandria (457-477, cf. list by Papadopoulos, S. 911). The answer of the bishops was that they were ready to accept the Council, and that they regarded Timotheos Aeluros not only as a murderer and an unworthy bishop, but also as unworthy even of the name of Christian (Nik. Kallistos 15, 16, Mansi VII, 530). Timotheos Aeluros (supported by the minister Aspar, who was a friend of the Monophysites) remained in Alexandria until the year 460 and then was banished to Gangra and the Chersonese. Leo of Rome was opposed to Timotheos Aeluros.

After this, Basiliskos became ruler of the Byzantine Empire. Without delay Basiliskos accepted Monophysitism and by his own uncircumscribed authority condemned, in an imperial circular letter, the decrees of Chalcedon and also the Tome of Leo (Euagrios 6, 101-104, 107). But this measure, which called forth the greatest indignation in Orthodox circles in Byzantium, hastened his fall. It is very characteristic that Timotheos was not an outspoken Eutychian, but maintained a theology of his own. The humanity of Jesus was neither essence (*ousia*) nor nature (*physis*), but "a law of the economy," which was not natural, but supranatural, "one nature (*physis*), one single divinity, although it was immutable." However, after Timotheos Aeluros had been restored to the throne of Alexandria by Basiliskos and had shortly thereafter died (477), the Orthodox patriarch was overthrown by military measures, and Petrus Mogos was elected as successor to Aeluros.

THE UNIFYING POLICIES OF THE EMPERORS FROM THE HENOTIKON OF ZENO (482) UNTIL THE 6TH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL

The unifying policy of the emperors was the result of a necessity of the Empire. For while the Duophysitism of the Nestorians was not so intelligible to the broad masses and therefore found no more than a national diffusion in Persia, Monophysitism proved more and more intelligible to the populace of the Oriental provinces. This can be well understood, since it emphasized the divinity of Jesus and the unity of His divine personality. It was this fact that led to the unifying policy of the Byzantine Empire. The responsibility of the emperors not only for the recovery of the provinces most important for the defense of the Eastern border of the Empire, but also for the economy of the European part of the

state, and the awareness of the emperor that the unity and integrity of the territory of the Empire must at all costs be preserved, led to a policy which, as a policy of compromise, called forth confusion in theological and ecclesiastical questions.

This policy which, after the Henotikon of Zeno (482), may be termed the Henotike policy (policy of unity), lasted, apart from periodic interruptions, for approximately 200 years (482-680). The unifying policy of the emperors, from the time of Zeno onwards, attempted to win the Orthodox and Monophysites for the Empire through theological and political compromise. The enforcement of the dogmatic decisions (*horoi*) of Chalcedon, as this was attempted in the years 451-457, resulted in a sharpening of the peril to the unity and integrity of the Empire since a considerable majority of the native population had gone over to the Monophysites. The collapse of the Empire would have come much earlier, if the emperors had not introduced this policy of union. The population of the large provinces of Syria, Palestine and Egypt, in their national resistance against the centre of the Empire, were not willing to accept the 4th Ecumenical Council.

The task of the emperors was to meet the desires of this population; but at the same time they were forced to satisfy the majority of the Orthodox who demanded the official acceptance of the Council by the Empire. In order to do justice to this double task — so valuable to the Empire, but also so difficult of accomplishment — they sought a compromise formula which could serve their political purposes. The unity of the Empire based on the spiritual and ethical unity of the catholic church, was in danger as long as the unity of the church was not a reality.

It is not possible to go into the details of this policy of the emperors Zeno (after 482), Anastasius I, Justinian, Heraklios, Constantine II, for that would lead too far afield. But it is necessary to say that the compromise formula served the purpose of moving the Orthodox and the Monophysites of the Eastern provinces to unity. This was an impossibility from a spiritual and theological, i.e. ecclesiastical viewpoint, for it led necessarily either to the rejection or to an indirect denial of the 4th Ecumenical Council. The temporary success of the policy of union in some regions, for example in Palestine under the patriarch Martyrius, or the approval of this policy on the part of some patriarchs under Justinian I and Heraklios, could not in the long run be maintained.

For the decisions of Chalcedon were the logical extension of the decisions of the earlier ecumenical councils.

* * *

It is possible and perhaps right to say that the policy of insuring the integrity and the peace of the Empire through the union of Christians, theologically and ecclesiastically indefensible, required as its basis a political theology, namely the theology of the emperors. Justinian himself, and later Constantine V, had each his own theology, while the theological grounding of the politics of the other emperors is to be sought in the circle of their counsellors.

It is easy to understand why the theocratic state of the early Byzantine period was, in its church policies, concerned for the true faith of its subordinants, with a view to the fulfillment of its own interests. Orthodoxy was a public question and therefore the intervention of the emperor in theological questions is understandable. The decisions of the Ecumenical Councils always had political importance in relation to the peace and prosperity of the Empire. The intervention of the state in theological questions could, however, bring confusion with it. And the compromise formula of the imperial ordinances really did contribute to obscurities.

Thus the historical factors are of great importance in the separation of the Eastern churches. The compromise policy of the emperors proved impossible to maintain. The provinces were lost to the Empire almost for ever. One can finally maintain that the unifying policy suffered a double failure:

1. Politically: the provinces are lost; whether, and to what extent the population of these provinces can be made responsible is a question which is still open to debate.

2. Ecclesiastically: the ratification of the decisions of the 6th Ecumenical Council (680/1) by the emperors implied a clear admission on the part of the state that the "political theology" was incorrect, for the decisions of this council are the direct confirmation of the decisions of the 4th Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon.

It can be said that the solution of the christological problem as it was undertaken by the Ecumenical Councils until the 6th Council shows an inner logical consistency. It is based on Holy Scripture and tradition and on a free and eclectic, and therefore correct, application of philosophical concepts.

The politics of the Empire finally recognized the solution of the christological question which the theology of the catholic church had prepared and formulated.

* * *

This contribution is to be understood as a preliminary sketch. Later on it will be worked out in detail.

DISCUSSION: Concerning the Paper of Professor Konidaris

ARCHBISHOP TIRAN: It seems that non-theological factors played a decisive role in the dogmatical disagreement. It seems that the Byzantine Emperors imposed their opinion and used the Church for their political purposes.

DR. KHELLA: The same history that Professor Konidaris presented to us can be presented by us in a totally different way. It is well known that the martyrs in Alexandria are not the Chalcedonians but the non-Chalcedonians, who were violently persecuted.

PROFESSOR KONIDARIS: We cannot say on account of the theocratic system of Byzantium that the Emperors imposed their will. The great thing is that in matters of dogma, especially during the period between Zeno and 680, Orthodoxy always prevailed in the end. The political factor never had the last word, but the true dogma of Orthodoxy.

FATHER VERGHESE: Is it only during this period that this "henotike policy" of the Emperors prevailed within the Byzantine Empire?

PROFESSOR KONIDARIS: This was the policy especially during this period, but the beginnings of it are to be found in Constantine the Great, who based the unity of the peoples of the Empire on the unity of the Church. He named himself "Bishop of things outside the Church" (*ton ekatos*). This policy was definitely crystallized with Theodosius the Great who acknowledged the Orthodox "Catholic" Church as the official Church of the State (Const. 380 and 381). The faith of the citizens, however, was finally formulated by the Second Ecumenical Council (the creed of Constantinople including that of Nicaea).

August 13th, 1964, Morning Session.

THE PROBLEM OF THE UNIFICATION OF THE NON-CHALCEDONIAN CHURCHES OF THE EAST WITH THE ORTHODOX ON THE BASIS OF CYRIL'S FORMULA: "MIA PHYSIS TOU THEOU LOGOU SESARKOMENE"

By PROFESSOR JOHANNES N. KARMIRIS

Anyone will become perplexed who today objectively and unbiasedly investigates the ecclesiastical events of the fifth century A.D. occasioned by Monophysitism. This perplexity is due to the fact that one can find no sufficient dogmatic-ecclesiastical reason for their having detached themselves from the stem of the Orthodox Catholic Church of the East to which they still organically belong. If one also investigates their dogmatic teaching which developed in the following fifteen centuries together with their way of worship, their ecclesiastical structure and their government, one must conclude with astonishment that they agree with the Orthodox Catholic Church in almost all "necessaries," the exception being a vague difference of opinion with regard to the verbal formulation of the dogma of Chalcedon — a difference which is probably more terminological than real. And indeed these churches today appear to us to accept a special form of moderated Monophysitism (as it can incorrectly be named), a Monophysitism which restricts itself only to the acceptance of a divine-human nature, united and joined in Christ. Though they accept this moderated Monophysitism, they at the same time, with the Orthodox Catholic Church, condemn the archheretic, Eutyches, and his pure, unadulterated Monophysitism. This inconsistency can probably be traced to a misunderstanding of the Greek-Orthodox dogmatic terms "ousia," "physis," "prosopon," "hypostasis," "hypostatike enosis," "Logos," etc., which could not be precisely translated into the eastern national languages of the peoples to whom these churches belonged. This is the only major difference between the Orthodox and the above-mentioned venerable eastern churches, a difference which has been blunted significantly with the passing of the centuries so that one can say that it really is restricted to a difference of words and formulations. This difference increased because of the unclarity of their dogmatic doctrine and the interruption of their further dogmatic and theological development.

Similarly, the separation involves several other secondary and unessential differences, e.g. with regard to the number of ecumenical councils, the number of church fathers who are to be venerated and other liturgical and canonical differences and customs.

An opinion similar to that expressed above has remained alive among many Orthodox and many adherents of the other eastern churches from the fifth until the twentieth centuries. This can be seen

- 1) From the participation by certain Armenian bishops in the Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Ecumenical Councils, from the canons of the Trullanum,¹ which are concerned with the Armenians;
- 2) From the condemnation of the "three chapters," pronounced by the Fifth Ecumenical Council, which was received by the non-Chalcedonian churches; from the encyclical addressed to "all bishop's sees in the East" (866)² by the Patriarch of Constantinople, Photius;
- 3) From the negotiations between Byzantine and Armenian representatives in the twelfth century which were in favour of union, and particularly from the famous "discussion" of the Byzantine Theorianos with the Armenian Catholicos, Nerses IV;³
- 4) From the declaration published by the local Orthodox Synod of Jerusalem (1672)⁴ in favour of the non-Chalcedonian churches;
- 5) And from the declaration of the Ecumenical Patriarch in 1951;⁵
- 6) From the amicable attitude during the meeting between Orthodox and non-Chalcedonian representatives at the First Pan-Orthodox Meeting at Rhodes in 1961.

The classical dogmatician of the Orthodox Church, John of Damascus, successfully expressed Orthodoxy's positive attitude towards the non-Chalcedonian Christians of the East when he said that he considered them, "on the basis of the Constitution of Chalcedon, to be separated from the [Orthodox] Church only with

¹ Joh. Karmiris, *The Dogmatic and Symbolic Monuments of the Orthodox Catholic Church* (Athens, 1960), vol. I (2), pp. 231, 233, 234.

² *Ibid.*, p. 322.

³ Migne, P.G., 133, 119-297. See also, B. Stefanides, *Church History* (Athens, 1948), p. 380.

⁴ Joh. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, vol II (1), 1953, p. 731.

⁵ *Ibid.*, vol I (2), p. 172. "Orthodoxia" (Constantinople) 26 (1951), 483, 490.

regard to their geographical position, while being Orthodox in all other things."⁶ Because of this situation, it is necessary that on both sides intensive efforts be made towards the reunion of the non-Chalcedonian churches with the Orthodox Church.

Self-evidently, all discussions and endeavours towards union must concentrate on the one serious dogmatic difference of opinion existing between them in order to eliminate it. This difference of opinion concerns the dogma of the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ, as formulated at the Fourth Ecumenical Council. As soon as this difference is settled, the other smaller ones existing between them can easily be eliminated. With regard to this cardinal difference we believe that, provided that the dogma of Chalcedon remains untouched, a new *formula concordiae* could be found for the Orthodox Church and for the non-Chalcedonian churches separated from it which would satisfy both sides; because in regard to the essence of the dogma there does not seem to be any real difference. The entire difference of opinion of the non-Chalcedonian eastern churches is based in their traditional, monophysitizing formulation of the dogma of the union of the two natures in Christ, although these churches understand this dogma in an almost Orthodox manner, believing that the two natures, the divine and the human, "neither mixed nor changed," are united in Christ. The difference of opinion which arose at the time of the Fourth Ecumenical Council and which was confirmed thereafter, seems afterwards to have increasingly lost its incisiveness and has almost completely disappeared today. Admittedly, the separated eastern churches hesitate to acknowledge the Fourth Ecumenical Council and clearly to confess the two natures in Christ. On the other hand, they accept the two natures in all essentials, as "neither mixed nor changed nor divided," rejecting only the Chalcedonian "en duo physisi" (in two natures) after the union and holding to the "ek duo physeon" (from two natures) before the union. Therefore, we believe that the phrase of St. Cyril of Alexandria which is more used by and satisfactory to the monophysitizing churches, could be proposed as the basis for the desirable union. This phrase reads: "Mia physis tou Theou Logou sesarkomene" or the more Orthodox "sesarkomenou" (one incarnate nature of the God-Logos). In using it, it would be understood and interpreted in an Orthodox way, being generally

⁶ *De haeres.*, 83. Migne, P.G., 94, 741.

understood in terms of Cyril's doctrine of the union of the two natures in Christ.

However, how do St. Cyril and the later Orthodox fathers understand the phrase "mia physis tou Theou Logou sesarkomenē"? Clearly they interpret the term "one nature" as *one* hypostasis, as *one* person of the God-Logos, who became incarnate. In other words, they view this phrase as being equivalent in meaning to the statement of John the Evangelist "the Word became flesh" (John 1:14). And, in fact, when they concerned themselves with Nestorius' false teaching of "two natures = two persons," they believed that they could answer him by emphasizing the "one nature," that is, by emphasizing the one hypostasis, the one person of the God-Logos, which was used as the basis for the hypostatic union of the divine and the human natures. As is well known, the terms "nature," "hypostasis" and "person" were equated at that time since they were regarded as synonymous and identical. For that reason, the term "nature," in the phrase in question, is to be understood as "person" in and of itself, i.e. the person of the eternal God-Logos. St. Cyril writes: ". . . the nature of the Logos, i.e. the hypostasis, which is the Logos itself."⁷ By means of the preceding word "one" every Nestorian sense of a division of the one person of the incarnate Logos of God is excluded and his unity is stressed. Moreover, the participle translated by the English word "incarnate" declares that the human nature, when the fullness of time was come, was received by and hypostatically united to the eternal Logos of God. Thus, this participle occurs also in Cyril's writings both in the nominative, to agree with the word "nature," as in the phrase quoted above, and in the genitive, to agree with the phrase "of the Son and Logos," as in the following: "mia physis Huiou sesarkomenou" (one nature of the incarnate Son), and "mian einai pisteuomen ten tou Huiou physin, hos henos plen enanthropesantos kai sesarkomenou"⁸ (we believe in the one nature of the Son, but as having become man and flesh). According to this, the expression "one nature" means one hypostasis, one person, but not, as Nestorius believed, two natures, i.e. two hypostases, or two persons, after the union. This is true because the "one nature," i.e. the one hypostasis of the God-Logos, "became incarnate." It is thus united without mixture with the

⁷ Cyril of Alexandria, *Apology*, Migne, P.G., 76, 401.

⁸ Cyril of Alexandria, *Epist.*, 40, Migne, P.G., 77, 192/3.

human nature, received fully and completely from the Virgin Mary — a human nature which never existed before and outside of the hypostatic union ("ou gar prohypostase kath' heauten sarki henothe ho Theos Logos" — because the God-Logos did not unite with a human nature, pre-existing of itself),⁹ being without hypostasis (anhypostatos) and without person (aprosopos) "in contemplation" (en ennoiais); because as person it used the person, or hypostasis, of the God-Logos.¹⁰ For this reason, the term "nature," both in Cyril's expression "one nature" and in Nestorius' term "two natures," has the meaning of hypostasis (or person) of the one who exists in and of himself, as said already. According to St. John of Damascus, St. Cyril understands by the "expression 'incarnate' the essence of the flesh; with the term 'one nature' he understands the one hypostasis of the Logos . . . i.e. his divinity. . . . Thus, they are two natures" (tou eipein sesarkomenene, ten tes sarkos ousian . . . dia de tou mian phisin, ten mian hypostasin tou Logou . . . t.e. tes theotetos autou . . . hoste duo eisi physeis).¹¹ Cyril emphatically places the "one nature" = the one person of the incarnate God-Logos, in opposition to Nestorius' "two natures" = two persons. But he understands the one person to be the bearer of both natures, these being "neither mixed nor changed," but joined in such a way that no confusion, mixture or change, no assimilation or transition of the one into the other nature occurs: "ouch hos tes ton physeon diaphoras aneremenes dia ten henosin."¹² In this way Cyril avoided not only Monophysitism but also Apollinarism in combatting Nestorianism.

That St. Cyril of Alexandria really uses the term "nature" in the sense of "hypostasis" or "person," i.e. with the meaning of the God-Logos himself together with the flesh united to him, is indicated often in his writings. Thus, in order to combat the Nestorians who imagine or confess "that the hypostases are separate after the indivisible union" and thus hold that there are "two Sons," he taught that the Lord, "being God by nature, became incarnate and therefore became a man, animated by a rational soul . . . on this account, all of the terms which are to be heard

⁹ John of Damascus, *Expositio orth. fidei*, III, 2. Migne, P.G., 94, 985.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, III, 11, P.G. 94, 1024/5.

¹¹ John of Damascus, *op. cit.*, III, 7, 8. *De comp. nat.* 3. Migne, P.G., 94, 1012/3. 95, 116/7.

¹² Cyril of Alexandria, *Epist. 4, ad Nestor.* Migne, P.G., 77, 45.

in the Gospels are to be attributed to one person, to one incarnate hypostasis of the Logos" or "to one hypostasis of the incarnate Logos because the one Jesus Christ is Lord according to the Scriptures."¹³ Being used interchangeably, the terms "nature," "hypostasis" and "person" become synonymous. "One nature, therefore, one hypostasis of the incarnate God-Logos, i.e. one person, one Lord." Consequently, as Emperor Justinian confirmed, "the term 'nature' was used in place of hypostasis."¹⁴ Thus, with regard to its contents, the phrase "one incarnate nature of the God-Logos" is Orthodox; it is only its external expression and formulation which seem to remind one slightly of Monophysitism. Thus, as already stated, the term "nature of the God-Logos" testifies to the divine nature and the term "incarnate" testifies to the human nature which is not of itself an hypostasis, but has become "enhypostatos," so to speak, in the hypostasis of the Logos. Furthermore the term "one nature" testifies to the one hypostasis (or one person) of the God-Logos, i.e. to the one God-Logos, who has become flesh according to St. John's formulation (John 1:14). The unity of the person, i.e. of the bearer of both natures, is preserved in that the entire phrase is equated with the following ones: "one God-Logos incarnate" or "only one is Christ, the Logos from the Father, with his own flesh."¹⁵ Thus, St. Cyril assumes two complete natures from whose hypostatic union the one Christ resulted. He therefore does not hold that there is one nature in the monophysitic sense, i.e. that there is one substance of divinity and humanity — a view which was condemned by the Fifth Ecumenical Council.¹⁶ As a result, we have here, with respect to contents, the dogma of Chalcedon about the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ. However, it is expressed in the style of the theological school of Alexandria which emphasizes the one person of Christ, thus stressing the one Christ in antithesis to the Antiochian school which emphasized the persons — and thus two Christs — in the union and after it. Thus, Cyril of Alexandria himself, the Fifth Ecumenical Council, the Confession of the Emperor Justinian,

¹³ Cyril of Alexandria, *Apologeticus*, Migne, P.G., 76, 340; *In Job. fragm.* P.G., 74, 24.

¹⁴ Emperor Justinian, *Confessio fidei*, in *Maus, Sacrorum Conciliorum . . . Collectio*, 9, 545.

¹⁵ Cyril of Alexandria, *Epist. 17*, Migne, P.G., 77, 112. Joh. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, I (2), p. 142.

¹⁶ Joh. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, I (2), p. 195.

Leontius of Byzantium, John of Damascus and other Orthodox fathers understood the phrase "one incarnate nature of the God-Logos" in this Orthodox sense.

However, how does Cyril understand the union of the two natures (as indicated in the above-mentioned phrase) in a narrower and in a more general sense? This he explains elsewhere: "We said that the two natures united. However, we believe that after they united the nature of the Son is one, as though the division were already eliminated. And yet, this nature of the Son is that of one who has become incarnate and human. If one should say, however, that the Logos, being God, became incarnate and human, then any expectation of a change should be rejected (because he remained precisely what he was), and among us the entire, complete and unmixed union should be confessed also."¹⁷ In this way, any type of monophysitic misunderstanding of the union is excluded. And again he wrote elsewhere that "(the Logos) being by nature God, was begotten as man, not simply in terms of connection (*synapheia*), as he (Nestorius) says, whereby he has an external unity in mind (and therefore a relative one), but as a union which is true although one cannot verbally grasp it and which surpasses understanding. Thus he is to be understood as the one and only one; because the nature is to be understood as a single whole after the union, i.e. as the incarnate nature of the Logos himself. That is something which we can similarly conceive of with regard to ourselves; for a human being is truly one, although he is composed of dissimilar things, i.e. of soul and body."¹⁸ Thus, by the term "*mia physis*" here too he wishes to emphasize the unity of the person of the God-Logos by the phrase "one incarnate nature of the God-Logos." The unity of the person of Christ is after all the result of the hypostatic union of the two natures (without their having been mixed, merged or changed) just as the one true human being results from the union of soul and body — completely "disparate things." As our famous father and bishop, Athanasius, whose belief is a constant rule for Orthodoxy, also said in his writings: "two things, by nature unlike, have come together: i.e. divinity and humanity; the one resulting from both of these is Christ."¹⁹

¹⁷ Cyril of Alexandria, *Epist. 40*, Migne, P.G., 77, 192/3.

¹⁸ Cyril of Alexandria, *Adversus blasphem. Nestorii*, Migne, P.G., 76, 60/1. E. Schwartz, *Acta Concil. I.I*, 6, p. 33.

¹⁹ Cyril of Alexandria, *Homil. 8*, 6. Migne, P.G., 77, 572.

Furthermore, Cyril taught, that in uniting the two natures in Christ, the Orthodox "confess one Christ, one Son, the same one Lord and, accordingly, one incarnate nature of God." However, "no mixture, or synkrasis respectively, of the two natures occurred." ". . . the one nature is distinct from the other, out of both of which the one and only Christ is to be understood. Neither did they fail to recognize that where union is spoken about, it does not mean the coming together of one thing, but of two or more things which are by nature different. When we say 'union,' we thus confess the union of the flesh, which has a soul, and the Logos. And those who say 'the two natures' mean the same thing. Indeed, after the union, that which has been united cannot be divided. On the contrary, the Son is one, his nature one, as that of the incarnate Logos . . ." or, "according to the voice of John, the Logos became flesh."²⁰ Apparently, the phrase "his one nature" (*mia physis autou*) is to be thought of in connection with the preceding term "one Son" (*eis Huios*), as the one hypostasis of the Son, so that the unity of the person of the incarnate God-Logos was not annulled by assuming flesh — as also after the union "that which has been united can no longer be separated." Elsewhere, in countering a slanderous accusation against himself according to which he allegedly accepted, with the above-cited statements, a "mixing, i.e. alteration, or merging of the Logos with the body, i.e. a transformation of the body into the nature of divinity," he wrote that "the two natures, unmixed, unchanged and not transformed, have joined one another in indivisible union; because the flesh is flesh and not divinity even though it has become God's flesh. In the same way, the Logos is God and not flesh, even though he, according to his plan of salvation, made the flesh his own. . . . After the union we do not separate the natures from one another; nor do we divide the one indivisible Son into two Sons. But we confess that there is one Son and he is the one incarnate nature of the God-Logos, as the fathers said."²¹ With the last sentence and with this teaching, Cyril combatted the Nestorian division of the one into two Sons, and expressed the Orthodox faith in the one incarnate Son, i.e. in the Son who became flesh. He confessed: "The Logos from God the Father hypostatically

²⁰ Cyril of Alexandria, *Epist. 44, to Eulogius the Presbyter.* Migne, P.G., 77, 225.

²¹ Cyril of Alexandria, *op. cit., 45, to Sucensus the Bishop I.* Migne, P.G., 77, 232.

united himself with the flesh and thus there is one Christ with his own flesh, i.e. he is God and man at the same time" (*sarki kath' hypostasin henosthai ton ek Theou Patros Logon, hena te einai Christon meta tes idias sarkos, ton auton delonoti Theon te homou kai anthropon*),²² the bearer of both of the natures hypostatically united in him. Similarly, he condemned every idea of fusion in the union of the two natures, as also every idea of confusion, emptying (of the one into the other), reciprocal mingling, mixture, blending, mingling, change, alteration, transformation, conversion, or metastasis respectively, of those two natures.

Cyril elsewhere explained the Orthodox sense of the phrase "one incarnate nature of the God-Logos" as meaning the one God-Logos, who also assumed human nature and united himself with it. He wrote: "Again, those who distort what is correct have failed to recognize that it is in truth one incarnate nature of the Logos. Now if there is one Son who is by nature truly the Logos from God the Father who was born in a way which is inexpressible and who then, after assuming flesh (not flesh without a soul, but flesh with soul) spiritually issued from a woman as a man, then he is not to be divided into two persons or Sons, but remained one, not without flesh, nor external to a body, but having, by virtue of an indivisible union, his own (body). Anyone who says this asserts neither fusion nor a confusion nor anything else of this sort. Furthermore, such cannot be deduced from the term. If one would say to us that the only begotten Son of God became incarnate and man, that does not imply that the two natures were confused. Neither was the nature of the Logos transformed into that of the flesh, nor was that of the flesh transformed into that of the Logos. Each nature is to be thought of as remaining itself — thus according to the manner of expression offered by us. Inexpressible and impossible to grasp in words is the way in which he united himself and manifested to us the one nature of the Son, which nature, now, as I said, is the incarnate one. This is the case because the oneness is not attributed merely to that which belongs to the nature, but also to that which is joined in the synthesis which is man, consisting of body and soul. These are disparate things, differing in nature, which truly unite there and result in the one nature of the man. . . . There is, therefore, no reason to say

²² Cyril of Alexandria, *op. cit.*, 17, to *Nestorius*. Migne, P.G., 77, 120. Joh. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, I (2), p. 145.

that, if the one nature of the Logos had really become incarnate, then clearly a fusion and confusion would have had to take place, the human nature decreasing and disappearing. The human nature, however, was neither reduced, as they maintain, nor did it disappear. It completely suffices to assert that he became man, i.e. that he became incarnate. If we omitted this, then they would be in some way justified in their slander. Since, however, the phrase 'was incarnate' is necessarily added, where does a reduction or a sort of disappearance occur?"²³

Herewith, Cyril declares that he does not understand the phrase "one incarnate nature of the God-Logos" in a monophysitic sense, but in an Orthodox sense. He does so in asserting that he acknowledges the human nature, complete and intact, and thus without fusion or confusion, without reduction or decrease, as well as the divine one after their union in Christ. And elsewhere he adds: "When we spoke of the one nature of the Logos, we held back and did not add the term 'incarnate' to it, but left it to the divine economy. The word 'Logos' at the same time served as a not improbable foundation to those who formulate the question of what is perfect in humanity or, how our own inherent nature exists. However, since perfection in humanity and the expression of our individual existence is brought in by the mention of the term 'incarnate,' they should cease clutching at a straw. One should condemn those who reject the divine plan and deny the incarnation by withholding from the Son perfect humanity. When one says that he became incarnate, one is confessing the fact that he became man, clearly and indubitably. As a result, this does not hinder one from thinking that 'one Son only, Christ, exists and he is God and man, perfect in divinity as in humanity . . .' "²⁴ According to that, therefore, they "clutch at a straw" who still today wish to understand Cyril's phrase "one incarnate nature of the God-Logos" in a monophysitic way. Because this phrase includes both natures which are hypostatically united in Christ, and it teaches quite clearly that "only one Son, Christ, exists and he is God and man, as complete in divinity as in humanity." Cyril stressed this fact repeatedly when he taught that the eternal Logos of God, incarnate in time, had received the entire and complete

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 241.

²⁴ Cyril of Alexandria, *op. cit.*, p. 244. See also, Leontius of Byzantium, *Scholien VIII*, Migne, *P.G.*, 86/1, 1253.

human nature, consisting of body and soul, from the Virgin Mary. And thus, after rejecting Monophysitism he also rejected Apollinarianism which denied to Christ's human nature its reasoning soul, or spirit (*nous*), and for this reason employed the contested formulation "mía physis tou Theou Logou sesarkomene." In antithesis thereto, Cyril speaks of a union of two complete and real natures, "of things, i.e. of hypostases, which are joined" (*pragmaton egoun hypostaseon gegone synodos*),²⁵ so that the Lord was composed "out of two different kinds of things" (*ek duoin pragmatoin*),²⁶ both of which retained the natural dissimilarity and disparity which they possessed before their union in him. On that account he characterized the union of the two natures only too accurately as "indescribable," "inexpressible," "inconceivable," "completely inexpressible and surpassing understanding," "extraordinary," "paradoxical," and as "a magnificent mystery which surpasses understanding" and can only be glimpsed and worshipped in faith.

It follows from all which has been said, that Cyril of Alexandria understood the one person of the incarnate God-Logos who had also assumed human nature and had united it to his divine nature, by the phrase "the one incarnate nature of the God-Logos." For that reason he states that the incarnate Logos is worthy of worship. He even employs the phrase "one incarnate nature of the God-Logos" in order thereby to teach the one way of worship in which the incarnate Logos is to be worshipped, substituting the phrase "one nature of the God-Logos which is incarnate and is worshipped" (*mian physin tou Theou Logou sesarkomenen kai proskynoumenen*) for the phrase "*Huiion proskynoumenon*" (the Son who is worshipped). Thus he writes: we confess "not two natures of the one Son, one which is to be worshipped and one which is not to be worshipped, but one nature of the God-Logos which is incarnate and worshipped with his flesh in one act of worship. Neither do we confess two Sons, one of which is other than the true Son of God who is worshipped . . ."²⁷ Elsewhere he states that "we worship the Logos of God with his own flesh as

²⁵ Cyril of Alexandria, *To Those Who Dare to Advocate Nestorius' Doctrines*, Migne, P.G., 76, 396.

²⁶ Cyril of Alexandria, *Address to Theodosius XLIV*, Migne, P.G., 76, 1200.

²⁷ Cyril of Alexandria, *Apolog. and Prosphor.*, Migne, P.G., 76, 349. 1209. 1212.

one”²⁸ and that “we are accustomed to honouring the Emmanuel by means of an act of worship, not detaching, hypostatically, the body of the Logos which is united to him”²⁹ so that “we worship one God who is at the same time man, believing in him as in the one who consists of divinity and humanity.”³⁰ Here it should be noted that insofar as the worship cannot be related to the nature in itself, but only to the one bearer of both natures, it follows that Cyril means the one hypostasis — and thus the one person of the incarnate God-Logos in the Orthodox and not in the monophysitic sense — by the phrase “the one incarnate nature of the God-Logos.” That is, he means thereby the one God-Logos who became man and incarnate and who, together with his flesh, is worshipped in one act of worship, or as it was stated at the Fifth Ecumenical Council: “ton Theon Logon sarkothenta meta tes idias autou sarkos.”³¹

From the passages quoted above, as well as from many more, one can conclude that Cyril teaches the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ, i.e. the essential true and real union as opposed to the Nestorian “synapheia” (connection), i.e. an external, ethical and relative coexistence between the two natures. Yet, he conceives of the union as being without confusion, change or transformation and as being unchangeable, since the Logos of God “became incarnate neither by a metastasis or change, nor by a transformation into the nature of the flesh, nor by a confusion or fusion nor, as supposed by some, by a connection between two natures. Why those who suppose the latter do so is unexplained because the nature of the flesh is by nature unchangeable (*atreptos*) and not transformable (*analloiotos*).”³² Cyril repeats in many passages of his writings that the divine and human nature remained unchanged in Christ, united “asygchytos kai *atreptos*.” The last-mentioned adjectives were taken over by the Synod of Chalcedon. And for that reason he also agrees with the *expositio fidei* of the “Diallagai” with the Antiocheans of 433. He agreed with them in the essence of the Christological doctrine, always confess-

²⁸ Cyril of Alexandria, *Adv. Nestor.* 3, 1. Migne, *P.G.*, 76, 121.

²⁹ Cyril of Alexandria, *ibid.*, p. 97.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 60.

³¹ Joh. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, I (2), p. 195.

³² Cyril of Alexandria, *Epist. 55, concerning the sacred symbol.* Migne, *P.G.*, 77, 304.

ing one Christ, perfect God and perfect man, of one substance with the Father in nature because of his divinity and of one substance with us in nature because of his humanity; because the predicates occurring in the Gospels are distinguished as divine ones and human ones, some referring to the one person of Christ, others dividing themselves between the two natures.⁸⁸ And this doctrine was accepted by the Fourth Ecumenical Council as well as by the Catholic Church in the East and in the West.

With everything which we have set forth here, we have attempted to ascertain and to interpret the deeper meaning of the famous formulation of St. Cyril of Alexandria, namely "mia physis tou Theou Logou sesarkomene." This formulation is the one to which the adherents of the non-Chalcedonian churches of the East appeal also today, in that they view it as expressing, more or less, their faith in the dogma of the union of the two natures in Christ. If our above interpretation should be regarded as correct by them, especially since it is attested to by Cyril himself and by other later authentic sources, and if the above-mentioned Christian brothers really do accept and honour the entire Christological doctrine of St. Cyril as did the Fourth Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon and the whole Church of Christ in East and West, then the agreement and finally also the reunion with the Orthodox could be based precisely upon the above-cited formulation as above interpreted, and, in general, upon the Christological doctrine of St. Cyril of Alexandria — to be sure, interpreted in the Orthodox sense. As is well known, the church, since the First Ecumenical Council, has not hesitated to employ new terms, phrases and formulations in restating former expressions and expositions of dogmatic truths. The difficult discussions about the "homoousion" which the holy fathers carried on at that great Council might serve as an eloquent example of this. Therefore, the church is not obliged to remain inflexible and to wrangle over words and phrases; it has the right to change them or to replace them with others. The only qualification is that the essence of the Orthodox dogmas, which in any case must always remain unchanged, may not be affected or altered. And so in the case in question, the Church is entitled to use a new formulation which satisfies and unites divided Christians. For that reason we believe that if the eastern Christians really accept the Christology of St. Cyril, a Christology

⁸⁸ Joh. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, I (2), pp. 154 f.

accepted by the Orthodox as well, then the agreement desired by both sides can come about on the basis of his teaching. Also, with God's help, reunification could be achieved by drawing up a Christological formula of union and a text similar to that of the "Dialagai" of 433 and corresponding to Cyril's Orthodox doctrine. This, to be sure, must be done in such a way as not to invalidate the dogma of Chalcedon.

May, therefore, the eastern brethren re-examine the subject touched upon here in the spirit of Christian brotherliness and love, and may they then revise their attitude to the Fourth Ecumenical Council and the Orthodox Catholic Church, especially since they claim that they reject the extreme Monophysitism of Eutyches, whom they personally condemn as did the great Council of Chalcedon, a Council which they falsely consider to be Nestorian in tendency. Thereafter it will be easy to settle the other secondary and unessential differences which exist between the divided churches in the spirit of love and of desire for understanding. Included among these secondary differences are the following: those with regard to the form of worship, those in connection with the canon, those regarding the number of ecumenical councils, and that resulting from the veneration rendered to Dioskoros, Patriarch of Alexandria, by some members of the eastern churches. In this connection, it is granted that he was not damned for heresy by the Fourth Ecumenical Council but was only deposed because of anti-canonical activities. As Anatolios, the Patriarch of Constantinople, stated in the fifth session of that Council: "Dioskoros was not deposed because of the faith, but because he excommunicated His Lordship Leo, the Archbishop, and, though summoned before the Council three times, did not appear (dia ten pistin ou katherethe ho Dioskoros, all' epeide akoinonesian epoiese to kyrio Leonti to archiepiskopo kai triton eklethe kai ouk elthen)" before the council.³⁴ What is more, the same Dioskoros expressly rejected the false teachings of Eutyches.³⁵

³⁴ Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum . . . collectio*, tom. 7, 104; Metropolitan of Nevrokopiou Georgios, *The Union of the Coptic with the Orthodox Church Is Easy* (Greek), (Saloniki, 1952), pp. 53/9.

³⁵ Mansi, *op. cit.*, tom. 6, 633. Schwartz, *op. cit.*, tom. II, 1, 92. 168.

DISCUSSION: Concerning the Paper of Professor Karmiris

FATHER SAMUEL: In the main your position is fully acceptable to Severus. There might be one or two points of detail that I would refer to later. If this is the position of the Eastern Chalcedonians, then we are in complete agreement.

ABBA HABTEMARIAM: I agree with these sentiments of Fr. Samuel. Yet there seems to be some difficulty about the nature of the union." I would like to know what is really the difficulty for you in speaking about *mīa physis* after the union of two natures.

PROFESSOR KARMIRIS: We can speak of *one physis* after the union, but with the meaning of one *hypostasis*, with the four Chalcedonian qualifying adverbs: *asygchytos, atreptos, adiairetos, achoristos*.

ARCHBISHOP SEVERIUS: From our discussion so far I come to feel that there are no insoluble problems of doctrine between us concerning the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. We affirm that our Lord Jesus Christ is perfect God and perfect man, and that He is one Person and one nature. You also maintain the same faith by affirming that He is "in two natures." Whereas we emphasize the union of the natures, you insist on their distinctness.

We were afraid that the faith formulated by the Council of Chalcedon tended towards Nestorianism, and you were led by the misunderstanding that we were holding the heresy of Eutyches. However, the fact is that we are not Eutychians; neither are you Nestorians. Therefore, the way is clear before us for mutual understanding. This means that we have been, and still are, fighting about words and phrases.

We have all along been led by the feeling that there was enough ground at the Council of Chalcedon to justify our understanding that it favoured Nestorianism. But we see now that you understand the Council in a very different way, and that you exclude Nestorianism completely.

The fact that our difference is merely terminological was stated by one of our Church fathers, Gregory Bar Hebraeus of the thirteenth century, who was a man admirably conversant with the Greek language. "I am convinced," he said, "that the dispute of Christians among themselves is not based on essentials, but on words and terms. For all Christians confess that Christ our Lord is perfect God and perfect man without mixture and confusion of the natures. While one refers to the union (of the natures) as 'nature,' another calls it 'person' and a third 'prosopon.' Thus I see that all Christian people, though they remain separate, are, in fact, in agreement."

I am indeed most happy that this statement of Bar Hebraeus has been shown to be true to facts by our Consultation here.

PROFESSOR KARMIRIS: I have read the texts on both sides of the dispute. (a) I have come to the conclusion that there is no real difference between the Orthodox and the non-Chalcedonians as far as the essence of the Christological dogma is concerned, as all of them accept the teaching of St. Cyril of Alexandria. There is a difference only regarding the terminology and formulation of this dogma. In the same way there are sec-

ondary differences regarding worship, canon law, customs and uses, etc. But none of these things should divide the Churches; Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, wrote: "Where matters of faith are not denied and there is no case of falling away from the common and catholic teaching accepted by all, when some maintain different customs and uses, one should not condemn those who profess or accept them. . . ."

(b) The Fourth Ecumenical Council must be understood and interpreted in the light of the teaching of the Third Ecumenical Council, as well as of the Fifth which is more directly related to it, because between these three Councils there is an agreement, continuity and unity completed by the Sixth Ecumenical Council. The Fourth Ecumenical Council should be understood also in the light of the teaching of St. Cyril of Alexandria, on which it is principally based.

(c) The theologians who participated in this Consultation should suggest to their Churches the appointment of a mixed commission of Orthodox and non-Chalcedonian theologians to determine and study deeply all the points of agreement and disagreement on the Christological dogma, as well as on subjects regarding worship, church administration, etc. This Commission should draft a *formulam concordiae* on the Christological dogma on the basis of the teaching of St. Cyril of Alexandria and of the other ancient Church Fathers and submit it in due time to their churches. The appointment of this Commission must be discussed and decided by the Third Pan-Orthodox Consultation which is to take place in Rhodes during this coming November, and by the Consultation which is to take place in Addis Ababa in the near future. The decisions and the actions to be taken afterwards depend entirely upon the Synods of the churches concerned, which should promote further and in a canonical way the sacred cause of the reunion of their churches.

ARCHBISHOP TIRAN: I was glad to listen to Professor Karmiris. But I would request our Greek brethren to stop saying that the non-Chalcedonian Fathers of the Church did not understand the terms used during the Christological controversy. The misunderstandings were due to the imprecise use of the Greek terms by the Greeks themselves, and not to the inadequacy of the other languages. The Catholicos-Patriarch Nersess IV of Armenia, who negotiated for union with the Emperor and Patriarch of Constantinople during the seventies of the 12th century, states that the difference between the positions of the two sides is terminological and Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians are trying to express the same truth and the same orthodoxy. The realization of this fact did not help much to produce agreement, because there were many non-theological and sometimes non-essential elements which occupied the minds of people on both sides. However, we must thank God, the ground has now been cleared of these non-essential impediments and our task has thus been made easier.

PROFESSOR KARMIRIS: I agree with you. The problem of language is not a real one.

PROFESSOR MEYENDORFF: Our consultation seems to have reached a point where a common agreement seems to arise. This will probably become more obvious as the other papers are read.

If our difference is mainly terminological, then why were we separated for so many centuries? There may be something in the historical and cultural context which we need to clarify by investigation.

Our ecclesiologies are also identical. We do not insist on a single jurisdictional authority for the unity of the Church. The political unity of the Empire, a Roman idea, was however a dominant force in the early Byzantine history. It does not exist any more today, and no one should therefore be afraid of losing his independence.

We will have to find some kind of agreement in faith, but also a common approach to the historical background.

PROFESSOR ROMANIDES: The dogmatic continuity of both the Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian traditions through the Councils of Ephesus, 449, and Chalcedon, 451, can be seen in the fact that Dioscoros was considered quite Orthodox in his faith by such leading Fathers of the Council of Chalcedon as those represented by Anatolius of Constantinople. It is also significant that the Egyptian bishops asked to be temporarily exempt from signing the definition of Chalcedon on the grounds that they now, after the deposition of Dioscoros, had no Archbishop, and so could not act on the basis of the traditions of Egypt. They were criticized by some for placing a local synod above an imperial ecumenical synod. This discussion concerning the relationship between local and ecumenical synods demonstrates clearly that the ecumenical synods convened by the Roman Emperors were imperial in nature and had the character of a pan-imperial ecclesiastical senate gathered in order to inform the government about the faith and practice of the Church for purposes of incorporating Church teaching and practice into the legal and social structures of the Roman Ecumene. The Nature of these imperial synods was demonstrated very vividly by the fact that at the tenth session of Chalcedon, when the bishops had reached a point wherein the Ephesine Synod of 449 was becoming aggravatingly problematical in dealing with the case of Ibas of Edessa, the bishops moved that a request be made to the emperor that the 449 Synod be erased from the lists of Ecumenical Synods. This clearly proves that the decisions of 449 were considered politically and ecclesiastically binding. Until this point in the deliberations at Chalcedon some of the acts of Ephesus 449 were reversed by dealing with them one by one, and other acts were simply accepted, as for example the decisions concerning Theodore and Ibas who at Chalcedon were restored only when they anathematized Nestorius and accepted Cyril's *Twelve Chapters*. Therefore, not much attention was given to Leo of Rome's ravings over the heretical nature of this Dioscorian Synod. Besides indicating the ecclesiastico-political nature of the Ecumenical Synods, the aforementioned facts prove that the Council of Ephesus of 449 was not rejected for doctrinal reasons, especially since in this regard it simply repeated what was done at Ephesus I in 431. In the light of all this, first priority should be given in our discussions to whether or not the dogmatic decisions of individual synods are orthodox and not to whether or not the synods themselves are ecumenical. In a real sense even local synods are in nature ecumenical when the Orthodox faith is clearly proclaimed. One cannot fail to notice that Orthodox canon law makes frequent and precise provisions about the nature and function

of local synods, but no references to the canonical structure and function of an ecumenical synod which was extraordinary in nature and beyond the normal synodical system of the Church's life and teaching authority.

BISHOP SARKISSIAN: Would a new formula expressing our common understanding of Christology solve the problem? Would such a formula alone be considered as a sufficient basis for restoring our communion in faith? And, then, how do we deal with the other problems which sometimes are described as "minor"? I refer particularly to the problem of the Council of Chalcedon as such and to the later three councils considered Ecumenical by the Byzantine Orthodox Church.

PROFESSOR KARMIRIS: Only one tradition should be taken into account — the dogmatic one. All the other points should be subsidiary to the dogmatic tradition. This latter is common to both of us. Therefore, we must consider this sufficient for our union. No primacies of Patriarchs and Bishops need be discussed nor are we interested in changing the polity of the churches. Only in certain words and definitions do we disagree. It is sufficient to recall the difference between St. Cyril of Alexandria and John of Antioch, who differed in their formulation, without any real difference in their faith.

BISHOP EMILIANOS: But harmony of dogma may not be adequate. Are there any other doctrinal differences arising out of the other Councils?

PROFESSOR KARMIRIS: Chalcedon adopted above all the teaching of St. Cyril. The synod did not base itself on the Tome of Leo. The Tome of Leo is a piece of paper among many materials in the Council. Papal delegates asked for its adoption as definition but the Eastern fathers refused. Egyptians, Palestinians, Illyrians, all refused, including the bishops of Illyricum who were under the jurisdiction of Leo. We have our own fathers who are the true teachers of the faith.

There are no differences between the Councils of 431 and 451 in dogma. So also there is no difference between all seven Ecumenical Councils. The faith is one and the same in all the councils. All came out of the same common tradition of the first centuries. There is a continuity and unity of faith among the Seven Councils. So there are no outstanding problems between us, whether we accept three or seven.

The differences in liturgical forms, canon law, customs and practical issues, as well as in the names of certain fathers of the Church venerated by different churches, need not be a problem. These do not separate; the precise formulation of the Christological dogma is the only thing that needs to be done.

ARCHBISHOP TIRAN: Nationalism in the sense in which we understand it now may not have existed in the 5th and 6th centuries. Still, there was exploitation and domination of class by class, or ethnic group by ethnic group. There were peoples which were different from each other and were opposed to each other. There were territorial loyalties or oppositions. Syrian, Egyptian, Armenian social entities resisted the centralism of the Empire. These tensions, called by whatever name, played a large part in the quarrels touched off by the turn of events connected with the Council of 451.

I would also like to make a remark on the attitude of the Egyptian bishops in the Council. Their refusal to sign the definitions of the Council has ecclesiological significance. They did not consider themselves as independent individual bishops free to accept or reject the decisions. They thought of themselves as a corpus of Bishops under their head, the Pope of Alexandria. They considered themselves as representing a distinct national-territorial Church within the Church of Christ universal. They did not feel that they could act without their archbishop. It is perhaps this ecclesiological concept that developed into self-governing national churches of modern times. We could perhaps call this concept the collegiality of the bishops of a national church.

PROFESSOR ROMANIDES: But we must keep in mind that among the Greek speaking Orthodox there is no one national Church, but rather six autocephalous Churches and two semi-autonomous Churches. Constantinople, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Cyprus, Greece, Sinai, Crete, and the Dodecanese. The many provincial synods of the Roman Empire were already autonomous or autocephalous. In the ancient Church, as with the Greeks today, synodical autocephaly had nothing essential to do with national or ethnic identity. The same can be said about the Latin synods of the West before the German invasions. Italy, for example, had at least two autocephalous groupings of bishops with centers in Rome and Milan. When the Church of Russia became autocephalous at the end of the 16th century, the Orthodox of the Ukraine remained under the jurisdiction of Constantinople till the rise of the modern Orthodox idea of identity of nationality and autocephaly.

PROFESSOR KARMIRIS: The Orthodox Church has one basis of unity, formulated by Photius of Constantinople. "Whenever that which is violated is not the faith, nor there is a fall from the common and catholic decree, because other customs and laws are kept by others, he who knows how to judge rightly should not think that they who keep these fall into *adikia* or that they who do not accept them violate the law." Cultural differences need not divide the Church.

PROFESSOR SAMUEL: I should like to refer here to two minor points of difference between the paper of Professor Karmiris and the position of Severus of Antioch. For Severus, the word "nature" in both the phrases "from two natures" and "one incarnate nature" means *hypostasis*. But he makes it clear that, while taking the word "nature" in this sense, he excludes two possible erroneous interpretations. Thus, in the first place he rejects "two natures before the union," which he thinks is Eutychianism. Secondly, he renounces the idea of two conjoint natures, which for him is Nestorian *synapheia*. He then interprets the "from two natures" in this way. God the Son, an eternal nature or *Hypostasis*, when He became incarnate, individuated manhood in a hypostatic union with Himself. Therefore, the union was "from two natures," namely the eternal *hypostasis* of God the Son and manhood which was individuated in that union. In the union the natures converged into one *hypostasis*, and thus Christ is always "one incarnate nature or *hypostasis* of God the Word," or He is "one composite (*synthetos*) nature." Severus opposed the Chalcedonian phrase "in two natures" on the argument that it would imply only the idea of the

Nestorian *synapheia*. But he rejected with equal force the idea that Christ was "one ousia." In his view, it was not simply human nature that God the Son assumed, but a full individuated manhood. In spite of this terminological difference, we can see here agreement in the essence of the faith.

I was glad to hear Professor Karmiris say that conciliar decisions are permanently binding only when these decisions are dogmatic, not about non-dogmatic matters. This has many implications.

PROFESSOR FLOROVSKY: I should like to be an *advocatus diabolus* because I feel the need. First I am wholeheartedly in favour of a reconciliation between Eastern Churches, but I am not for over-emphasis on the East. Eastern ecumenism is a contradiction in terms. The West also belongs to the oikoumene. We cannot afford to forget the West — and the Tome of Leo. The Christian tradition is universal. The Byzantine Church was afraid of precipitating a schism by rejecting Leo. We must also be careful.

We must not over-emphasize confessional formulae and a direct intellectual approach. In practice we have to discuss the difficulties of plurality of practice, and the problems of psychological attitudes. Can we say that jurisdiction is not a problem for unity? That we need not have some central symbol of unity? Question of authority is important. Who can co-ordinate the various local or national churches? Who will prepare this confessional formula on behalf of the churches? We have to have a full meeting of the bishops on both sides. Who will convene this?

I have also doubts about agreement on the basis of a one-sided Cyrillic formula. I think it is important to come to terms with the later ecumenical councils.

PROFESSOR KARMIRIS: Professor Florovsky is right in speaking about authority. But glory be to God, all the Eastern churches have the synodical system, the competent organs of each church, with a presiding Bishop, Patriarch or Metropolitan. The question must first be discussed in all of these local synods. The text would have to be drafted by a working group and presented to all the synods of the churches. We can discuss this at Addis Ababa next January and at Rhodes in November. After discussion in two meetings it can be sent again to the churches for final ratification. Finally, all the bishops can come together in Council to finalize the decision. This is our Eastern synodical system of making decisions.

We should not have in mind the example of certain theologians or get bogged down in discussions of primacy and so on.

PROFESSOR NISSIOTIS: Inspired by our agreement, I would go further to say:

Something fundamental is revealed when we meet together. The dogmatic discussion is not an isolated piece. We both share in the dogmatic continuity of the churches. Our agreement is in the life of our churches, Christology — ecclesiology — anthropology are inseparable. And we have on both sides preserved this one tradition in its entirety; we are one in the whole of dogma — not just in one point. What is behind all this is the very profound understanding of the Holy Spirit in the Church. We have to make evident this common agreement in Pneumatology to the whole

oikoumene. The synodical system is not just a practical matter. It is the expression of our Christology and Pneumatology, our Eucharistic theology.

PROFESSOR SAMUEL: This is precisely why we consider ourselves Orthodox — not for prestige.

PROFESSOR KARMAKIS: St. John Damascene very clearly calls the non-Chalcedonians Orthodox in all matters with the exception of speaking of one *physis* after the union but not in the monophysite sense of one essence (*ousia*).

DR. KHELLA: The tragedy of Chalcedon is this: it had no formal conclusion as Ephesus 431. Our situation now is the same as, say, 432. If the reunion of 433 had not taken place, the 431 situation, that is the schism between Alexandria and Antioch, would have continued till now. But 451 did not come to a reunion formula.

In the period between 433 and 451 Cyril of Alexandria, John of Antioch and Proclus of Constantinople, the fathers and defenders of the union of 433, died. Their followers Dioscorus in Alexandria, Domnus in Antioch and Flavian in Constantinople did not trust each other. They brought the situation back to 432, as it was before the agreement of 433. It is very important to notice here that Leo of Rome was completely excluded from the discussion in the East: his later Tome was practically an arbitrary interference in matters which did not concern him.

One point which I like to emphasize in consideration of the paper of Professor Karmakis is that "*en duo physisin*" has no Greek tradition at all. It is surprising to find this coming out of Chalcedon. Chalcedonians would agree with us that "*ek duo phyeon*" is the more traditional formula. It is rather surprising that the Greek Church accepted this formula presented by Leo of Rome. Leo had little comprehension of the theological issue behind the two prepositions. Let us judge the issue on the basis of the Acts of the Council of 451, which seems to reject the *ek* in favour of *en*, after having almost accepted *ek*.

Our Church accepts all Greek Fathers up to Chalcedon, but then none of them spoke of two natures after the union. We do not need to spend time discussing the Christology of Eutyches; both sides reject him. In fact, he was not a qualified theologian though politically rather important. Eutyches was a monk; his asceticism demanded the disparagement of the body; Christ's flesh would be consumed by His spirit or by the power of the Logos.

Today we can rediscover our joint tradition and testimony which were interrupted for fifteen centuries. But 1500 years of separation need not become an insurmountable barrier. We have today the possibility of finding our common way to the expression of our unity.

August 13th, 1964, Afternoon Session.

ST. CYRIL'S "ONE PHYSIS OR HYPOSTASIS OF GOD THE LOGOS INCARNATE" AND CHALCEDON¹

By THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN S. ROMANIDES

Both Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian Orthodox accept St. Cyril as the chief Patristic exponent of Orthodox Christology. Yet both accuse each other of not remaining completely faithful to Cyril.

The non-Chalcedonian Orthodox reject the Council of Chalcedon and accuse it of Nestorianism because it accepted the *Tome of Leo*, *two natures after the union*, and allegedly omitted from its definition of faith such Cyrillian expressions as *One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate, hypostatic or natural union, and from two natures or from two One Christ*. The failure of Chalcedon to make full use of Cyril's *Twelve Chapters*, to condemn the Christology of *Theodore*, and its acceptance of *Theodoret* and *Ibas* throws suspicion on it. Then there is the weighty accusation that the very act of composing a new definition of the faith contradicted the decision of Ephesus (431) which decreed that, "It is unlawful for anyone to bring forward or to write or to compose another Creed besides that determined by the Holy Fathers assembled with the Holy Spirit in Nicaea."²

The Chalcedonian Orthodox, on the other hand, believe that it was Cyril's Christology which was not only fully accepted at Ephesus, but served as the basis of all judgments concerning Christology at Chalcedon in 451 and especially at Constantinople in 553. In spite of its obvious deficiencies the *Tome of Leo* is adequately Orthodox, definitely not Nestorian, and was accepted only as a document against Eutyches, but again only in the light of and in subordination to the synodical letters (especially the *Twelve Chapters*) of Cyril to Nestorius and John of Antioch, as we shall see. The terminology and faith of Cyril were fully accepted, although the Eutychian heresy, the chief concern of the Council,

¹ This paper presupposes familiarity with the article mentioned in note 4, p. 85.

² *Mansi*, iv, 1361.

called for some adaptation to the new situation. One may point out that the acceptance of the Chalcedonian definition was no different from the acceptance of Cyril's letters at Ephesus. Neither the one act nor the other can be considered as a composition of a new Creed. They are both interpretations and clarifications of the Nicaean faith in the light of modern circumstances. It is noteworthy that even Cyril had to defend himself against the accusation that he accepted a new Creed in his reconciliatory correspondence with John of Antioch.⁸ Theodoret and Ibas were restored to the episcopacy because they accepted Ephesus I and especially the *Twelve Chapters*, which acceptance is in itself a condemnation of what they had written about and against Cyril and his anathemas. The Fifth Ecumenical Council of 553 anathematized the writings of Theodoret and Ibas against Cyril and the very person of Theodore, the Father of Nestorianism.

The non-Chalcedonian Orthodox have been for centuries accusing the Chalcedonian Orthodox of being Nestorians. On the other hand, the Chalcedonians have been accusing the non-Chalcedonians of either being monophysites (which for them means believers in *one ousia in Christ*) or of a one-sided insistence on Cyrillian terminology to the exclusion of Cyril's own acceptance of two natures in the confession of faith of John of Antioch which brought about the reconciliation of 433. This one-sidedness was adopted by the Ephesine Council of 449 and rejected by the Council of Chalcedon. It should also be noted that the Flavian Ende-mousa Synod of 448 was one-sided in its use of and insistence on the Cyrillian terminology of the 433 reconciliation to the near exclusion of Cyril's normal way of speaking about the incarnation. From Chalcedon and especially from Constantinople II it is clear that the Chalcedonians without compromise allow for variations in terms which express the same faith. On the non-Chalcedonian side Severus of Antioch seems to be the only one who comes close to Cyril's acceptance of *two natures tei theorai monei* after the union, a position adopted at Chalcedon and clearly stated in the definition or anathemas of the Fifth Ecumenical Council.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss a few terms against the historical background of circumstances which called them up to serve as a test of correct faith. Especially important are the circumstances surrounding the Councils of 449 and 451. Undoubtedly

⁸ P.G., 77, 188.

a key figure which conditioned Dioscoros' exasperation with all talk of two natures was its extremely clever use by Theodoret to hide what one may call a clear case of crypto-Nestorianism. Leo's support of and failure to see through Theodoret made him guilty by association, as in some measure happened with Dioscoros' support of Eutyches. This explains a good deal of the negative attitude toward Leo's tome, not only from Egyptian quarters, but also from the Palestinian and, of all people, the Illyrian bishops, who were within Leo's own sphere of ecclesiastical influence.

The key to the approach of this paper is (1) to define Nestorianism as seen by Cyril in order to determine why Cyril could accept *tei theorai monei* two natures in Christ after the union and John's confession of faith, and then (2) to examine very briefly in the light of this definition Leo's Tome and the attitude toward and use of it by Chalcedon. In Part II we will examine what is clearly a case of crypto-Nestorianism in the person of Theodoret, and in the light of this we will survey some of the important aspects of the Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian encounter with this issue. Throughout the paper we will be concerned with the place of Cyril, and especially his *Twelve Chapters*, at Chalcedon, thereby determining whether or not the Fifth Ecumenical Council is really a return to or rather a remaining with Cyril.

PART I

1) Nestorius rejected the fact that He Who was born of the Virgin is consubstantial with the Father according to divinity and thus by nature God. Another way of saying this is that he rejected the fact that He Who before the ages is born from and is consubstantial with the Father was in the last days born according to His Own and proper humanity from the Virgin Mary having become thus by nature man and consubstantial with us. On the basis of this rejection Nestorius distorted the true significance of the title *Theotokos* which he in reality denied to the Mother of God. The most Nestorius could say is that Christ is the one person of the union of two natures, the one nature being by nature God and the other by nature man. The name Christ is not properly predicated of the Logos, but is the name of the person of union born of Mary and in whom the Logos dwells and who was assumed by the Logos. Nestorius fanatically insisted that the Logos was not born of the Virgin according to His Humanity and did not, therefore, become by nature man. On the basis of this he

divided the natures and predicates of Christ attributing the human to the assumed man and the divine to the Logos.

In the light of his denial of the two births of the Logos and the double consubstantiality of the One and the Same Logos, Son of God and the Self-Same also Son of Mary, and thus of the true meaning of the title Theotokos, Nestorius' insistence that he does not divide Christ into two persons, but only the natures and names, was judged a mockery of the faith and on this basis he was condemned by the Third and Fourth Ecumenical Councils and rejected by John of Antioch and Leo of Rome.

I have indicated elsewhere⁴ that the reconciliation of 433 between Cyril and John was brought about by the Antiochene's confession of the double birth and consubstantiality of "our Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God," the very doctrine rejected so violently by Nestorius and even by Theodoret, as we shall see shortly. In his confession John clearly declares that the *Only-begotten Son of God* was "before the ages begotten from the Father according to His Divinity, and in the last days the *Self-same* (ton auton) for us and for our salvation, (begotten) of Mary the Virgin according to His Humanity, the *Self-same* (ton auton — note that he is here speaking clearly about the Only-begotten Son and not the Nestorian and Theodoretan Prosopon of the union of two natures) consubstantial with the Father according to Divinity and consubstantial with us according to Humanity."⁵ For Cyril this confession of faith meant that the title Theotokos and the incarnation were accepted in their full and true significance, in spite of the fact that John spoke of "a union of two natures, whereby we confess One Christ, One Son, One Lord."

In his letter to Acacius of Melitene⁶ Cyril is quite emphatic about the fact that this Antiochene confession of the double birth and double consubstantiality of the One and the Same Logos cannot be suspected of Nestorianism since this is exactly what Nestorius denies.⁷ To the objection that two natures after the union

⁴ See my article, "Highlights in the Debate Over Theodore of Mopsuestia's Christology," in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, vol. v, no. 2 (1959-60), pp. 157-161.

⁵ *Mansi*, iv, 292.

⁶ P.G., 77, 184-201. See also *Ep. ad Eulogium*, P.G., 77, 224-228; *Ep. ad Successum I and II*, P.G., 77, 228-245.

⁷ P.G., 77, 189-192, 197.

means a predication of two separate kinds of names, divine and human, to two separate natures, Cyril replies that to divide names does not mean necessarily a division of natures, hypostases, or persons, since all names are predicated of the one Logos. The division of names is considered as a safeguard against Arians and Eunomians who by confusing them sought to demonstrate the creatureliness of the Logos and His inferiority to the Father. The names, and not the natures, are divided in order to distinguish the real difference of the natures or things out of which Christ is composed, and not to divide them, since they can be distinguished after the union in contemplation.⁸

Of course Cyril prefers to speak of *One Nature or Hypostasis of God the Logos Incarnate and become man*, since this better safeguards the union and the attribution of all things pertaining to Christ to the Logos as the subject of *all* human and divine actions. For Cyril *Physis* means a concrete individual acting as subject in its own right and according to its own natural properties. Thus the One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate, having by His second birth appropriated to Himself a perfect, complete and real Manhood, has as His Own both the ousia and natural properties common to all men, whereby it is the Logos Himself Who is Christ and lives really and truly the life of man without any change whatsoever in his Divinity, having remained what He always was. To speak about two natures in Christ would be somewhat equivalent to a Chalcedonian speaking about two Hypostases in Christ. In this respect a Chalcedonian would accept and does accept everything Cyril says but would use Cyril's *One Hypostasis of God the Logos Incarnate*, since for him *Physis* means *Ousia*.

The one very essential point which Cyril makes and which some day may be given adequate consideration by the non-Chalcedonian Orthodox is that whatever one's insistence on theological accuracy in expression may be, it is sheer caricature to accuse anyone of being Nestorian who accepts the double birth and double consubstantiality of the Logos as the basis for the title Theotokos, as well as for the predication of all human and divine attributes and energies to the Logos Who is the sole subject incarnate and acting, both according to His Divinity and His Own appropriated Manhood. This is what Theodore, Nestorius, and Theodoret de-

⁸ P.G., 77, 193-197.

nied and this is the essence of Orthodoxy. St. Cyril saw this clearly and it is our duty to place this at the centre of our discussions.

2) There is no doubt that Leo tended to separate or distinguish the acts of Christ in such a way that the two natures seem to be acting as separate subjects, a tendency explainable by what he imagined Eutyches was teaching and by his Latin formation wherein Greek Trinitarian terms used in Christology were not available to him. He so obviously failed to understand how the term *One Nature* was being used in the East, and especially during the Endemousa Synod of 448. This is why a non-Chalcedonian reading the Tome should read *ousia* upon coming across *natura*, since Leo was dealing with the information he had received that Eutyches denied Christ's consubstantiality with us. His expression of utter amazement that the judges did not severely censure Eutyches when making such a statement as, "I confess that our Lord was from two Natures before the Union, but after the Union I admit but one Nature," confirms the confusing of his own *natura* and the Greek *ousia* with *physis*. Then Eutyches' own confusion of the terms *ousia* and *physis* did not help the matter any.

Nevertheless, Leo is very clear in his acceptance of the anti-Nestorian standard of Orthodoxy accepted by Cyril. Leo declares clearly in his Tome that "the Self-same, who was the Only-begotten and Everlasting One of the Everlasting Parent, was born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary. And this birth in time takes away nothing from that divine and eternal birth, nor does it add anything to it. . ."⁹

The definition of Chalcedon is also clear in this respect. "Following, then, the holy Fathers, we all unanimously teach that our Lord Jesus Christ is to us One and the same Son, the Self-same of a rational soul and body; consubstantial with the Father according to the Godhead, the Self-same consubstantial with us according to the Manhood . . . before the ages begotten of the Father according to the Godhead, but in the last days, the Self-same, for us and for our salvation (born) of Mary the Virgin Theotokos according to the Manhood. . ."¹⁰

Returning to Leo's Tome it is important to point out that at Chalcedon it was accepted only as a document against the heresy

⁹ T. H. Bindley, *The Ecumenical Documents of the Faith* (London, 1950), p. 224.

¹⁰ Mansi, VII, 116.

of Eutyches, in spite of the fact that both Leo and his legates believed it to be a good statement against Nestorius also. It is even more important to keep in mind that during its reading at Session II the three now famous Nestorian sounding passages were each one challenged as the document was being read. During each interruption it was attacked and defended by the use of parallel passages from Cyril.¹¹ After what must have been a somewhat stormy and long debate, bishop Atticos of Nikopolis in Old Epirus, Greece, made the motion that time out be taken to give the assembly the opportunity to carefully compare Leo's Tome with the *Twelve Chapters* of Cyril in order to make sure of what they were approving.¹² The imperial representatives chairing the meeting gave the bishops five days in which to do this and suggested the formation of a committee under the presidency of Anatolius, Patriarch of Constantinople.¹³ The committee reported back at the fourth session, at the beginning of which the imperial and senatorial representatives declared the unswerving faith of the emperor in the expositions of Nicaea, Constantinople, and Ephesus with its approval of the "two canonical letters of Cyril," i.e., the Second and Third to Nestorius.¹⁴ This profession of the imperial faith had been made also at the end of Session I,¹⁵ and now in anticipation of the committee's report on the question of Leo's agreement with Cyril's *Twelve Chapters* it was repeated. The committee report¹⁶ was included in the minutes in the form of a listing of the individual opinions of its members, all of whom expressed their belief that Leo's Tome agreed with Nicaea, Ephesus, and the letter of Cyril. Most of the bishops mentioned the (one) letter of Cyril,¹⁷ which cannot be any other than the *Twelve Chapters* since this was the one the Illyrians and Palestinians were concerned about as is clear from the motion of the Illyrian Atticos which initiated the careful comparison of Leo's Tome with the letter of Cyril. Some of the members mentioned their belief that the Tome agreed with the two letters of Cyril, clearly referring to the ones of Ephesus mentioned as part of the imperial faith. It is ex-

¹¹ *Mansi*, VI, 972-973.

¹² *Mansi*, VI, 973.

¹³ *Mansi*, VI, 973.

¹⁴ *Mansi*, VII, 8.

¹⁵ *Mansi*, VI, 937.

¹⁶ *Mansi*, VII, 48.

¹⁷ *Mansi*, VII, 36-45.

tremely interesting to note that among the similar individual opinions given by the rest of the Assembly and recorded in the minutes is that of none other than Theodoret of Cyrus,¹⁸ who claims that he finds the Tome of Leo in agreement with the letters of Cyril and the Council of Ephesus, certainly a tremendous leap from his position just before the Council. In the light of his strong hesitation at Session VIII to anathematize Nestorius, a hesitation which infuriated the assembly, one wonders about his sincerity, especially since he tried to defend his former acts by an exposition of how he never taught two Sons. He was interrupted by shouts of "Nestorian."¹⁹

The acceptance of Leo's Tome in the light of and in subordination to the letters of Cyril is also clearly contained in the Chalcedonian definition itself.²⁰ It is declared that the Council accepts the Synodical (the Third letter to Nestorius is titled synodical, or since this is in the plural it could be a reference to the two of Ephesus, which in the minutes are called canonical, plus the one to John) letters of Cyril to Nestorius and to those of the East, "and to which (epistles) it reasonably adapted the letter of Leo . . . (epistolas . . . hais kai ten epistolen tou Leontos . . . eikotos synermose . . .)." This is not a case of a balance between Cyril and Leo, as many scholars would have us believe. Leo became very sensitive about the doubts raised about his tome, and especially disturbed did he become over determined opposition in certain quarters like Palestine where Juvenal was deposed for accepting the Tome. In a letter to Julian of Cos (cxvii, 3) in which he shows much concern with accusations of heresy against himself, he writes that, ". . . if they think there is any doubt about our teaching, let them at least not reject the writings of such holy priests as Athanasius, Theophilus and Cyril of Alexandria, with whom our statement of the faith so completely harmonizes that anyone who professes consent to them disagrees in nothing with us." No one can doubt the sincerity with which Leo wanted to be in agreement with those Alexandrine Fathers, but his defense of Theodoret compromised him. In a letter to the now restored Bishop of Cyrus he chides Theodoret for the tardy way in which he anathematized Nestorius (cxx, 5), yet in his opening remarks

¹⁸ *Mansi*, VII, 20.

¹⁹ *Mansi*, VII, 188-192.

²⁰ *Mansi*, VII, 113.

of this very same letter he speaks of "the victory you [Theodoret] and we together had won by assistance from on high over the blasphemy of Nestorius, as well as over the madness of Eutyches." Dioscoros' relationship to Eutyches may have some parallels.

The Chalcedonian definition also speaks of itself as "preserving the order and *all* the decrees concerning the Faith passed by the Holy Synod held formerly at Ephesus. . . ."²¹ From Ibas' *ad Maxim Persam* and from the minutes of the Johannine Council of Ephesus, we learn that the Antiochenes rejected the Cyrillian Council of Ephesus and damned Cyril because the heretical *Twelve Chapters* had been accepted.²² In this same letter Ibas (as were many of Cyril's friends and Theodoret)²³ was under the impression that Cyril abandoned his Ephesine position in his reconciliation with John in 433.²⁴ However, Ibas stated at his trial in Byretus in 449 that Paul of Emessa had accepted the Alexandrine bishop's interpretation of the *Twelve Chapters* as Cyril had accepted the confession of the Easterners.²⁵ It is in the light of this that one should read the letter of John to the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Constantinople (the order of the letter) in which he announces Antioch's acceptance of Nestorius' excommunication and the Council of Ephesus.²⁶ It is impossible to accept the opinion of many that Cyril laid aside his *Twelve Chapters* for the sake of a reconciliation with John. As an individual he had no authority whatsoever to modify the decisions of an Ecumenical Council and there is no evidence to substantiate this supposition. Although the Endemousa Synod of Constantinople seems to have overemphasized the Cyrillian allowances of 433, it accepted the *Twelve Chapters* as part of Ephesus which it approved *in toto*.²⁷

In the light of the evidence it is clear that Cyril's Third letter to Nestorius, including the *Twelve Chapters*, was not repudiated by Chalcedon as many claim. On the contrary, the *Twelve Chapters* were used as the very basis of the Council's attitudes toward Nestorianism and Leo's Tome. It is too bad that the Chalcedonians themselves present at the Council of 531 in Constantinople

²¹ *Mansi*, VII, 109.

²² *Mansi*, IV, 1265 ff.; VII, 244-245.

²³ *Ep. CLXXI, P.G.*, 83, 1484.

²⁴ *Mansi*, VII, 248.

²⁵ *Mansi*, VII, 240.

²⁶ *Mansi*, V, 285.

²⁷ *Mansi*, VI, 665.

did not fully realize the crucial role played at Chalcedon by Cyril's *Twelve Chapters*. Their answer to Severus' accusation that the *Twelve Chapters* were laid aside in 451 was that it was accepted and approved as part of Ephesus I. This, of course, is uncontested, but not anywhere near the reality of the matter. The significance of the use made of the *Twelve Chapters* at Chalcedon should be obvious enough to those who claim that they fail to find the terms characteristic of Cyrillian Christology in the definition. Groundless also are the theories (brought forward by many Protestant and Roman Catholic scholars embarrassed by the Cyrillianism of the Fifth Ecumenical Council) concerning an alleged neo-Chalcedonian movement which was supposed to have put Leo's Tome aside and returned to the *Twelve Chapters* of Ephesus I, especially to the *twelfth anathema*. The truth of the matter is that in pronouncing anathema on those who do not accept the *Twelve Chapters* of Cyril, the Fifth Ecumenical Council of 553 is simply repeating what was done at Ephesus in 431 and again at Chalcedon in 451.

PART II

Now we must turn to the crypto-Nestorianism of Theodoret, a type of Christology which in some measure can hide itself behind the language used in the formulary of reunion of 433, without, however, adopting its exact wording and meaning. It was undoubtedly his exasperation with this type of Antiochene Christology more than anything else which goaded Dioscoros into setting aside Cyril's act of 433 and returning to what may be called Alexandrine exclusiveness as the only sure means of uprooting the new form behind which Nestorianism hid itself.

In the course of the Christological controversies Theodoret learned to modify some of his opinions without, however, changing his basic vision and presuppositions. For example, he rejected Cyril's suggestion that the Logos Himself became by nature man,²⁸ but by the time he wrote his *Eranistes* he had adapted, to some degree, his language to that of Cyril. In some contrast to Nestorius he claims that "the Truth is both God by nature and man by nature."²⁹ In another work he says that "the Same is by nature God and man."³⁰ He Who was born of the Virgin, according to

²⁸ *Ep. De XII Capitulis*, P.G., 76, 388A.

²⁹ P.G., 83, 121B.

³⁰ *Demonstraciones*, P.G., 83, 328A.

Theodoret, is consubstantial with the Father according to His Godhead and consubstantial with us according to His Manhood. Christ was born, says the bishop of Cyrus, before the ages from God the Father and in our own time the Selfsame Christ was born from the Virgin Theotokos.³¹ These expressions are not those of Nestorius, yet they are not completely Orthodox. The name Christ, for Theodoret, is predicated of the Logos because the Only-begotten Son of God assumed a man or manhood which was born from the Virgin.³² Until his acceptance of the Third and Fourth Ecumenical Councils, Theodoret could not say that the Logos Himself, being by nature God, became according to the flesh by nature man, or consubstantial with us, by His second birth in time from the Virgin Mary, while remaining immutably what He was. Such a double birth and the double consubstantiality must be predicated of Christ alone and not the Logos. Only divine names can be predicted of the Logos.³³ Yet all names, both human and divine, can be predicated of Christ because of the union in Him of the two natures.³⁴ Thus, when Theodoret says that He Who was born of the Virgin is consubstantial with God the Father, he does not mean that He Who is consubstantial with the Father was born of Mary in the flesh. The name Christ seems to be the only one Theodoret allows to be predicated of the Logos in the flesh, and by means of this he avoids saying with Nestorius that Christ is the Son of David and Son of God united in His (Christ's) One Person. Yet he clearly follows Nestorius by distinguishing the Only-begotten Son and Christ in the Creed by insisting that the name Jesus Christ, and not the title of Only-begotten Son, is the recipient of the things human such as birth, suffering, death, burial and resurrection.³⁵ His attempt to explain why only the name Christ of all things human should be predicated of the Logos in the flesh is a Nestorian failure. Thus it was the prosopon of Christ Who suffered, died, and was buried in the tomb, not the impassible Logos in His Own passible manhood.³⁶ When St. Paul speaks of the Lord of Glory being crucified he means that the body of the

³¹ P.G., 83, 1420.

³² P.G., 83, 264B; 280-281.

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ P.G., 83, 148AB; 252CD; 231A.

³⁵ P.G., 83, 280BCD-281B.

³⁶ P.G., 83, 257CD; 261BCD.

Lord of Glory was crucified, not that the Lord of Glory was crucified in the flesh.³⁷

Very instructive on the question of dividing the names between the two natures and uniting them, not in the Logos, but in the name Christ, which includes the Logos, is Theodoret's version of the formulary of reunion or Antiochene confession of faith. The linguistic variations between the confessions are doctrinally quite revealing. We will quote Theodoret's version³⁸ and insert in their proper places within brackets and in capitals the longer text of John and underline the one phrase in Theodoret's creed missing from that of John.

"We confess one Lord Jesus Christ, (THE ONLY-BEGOTTEN SON OF GOD), perfect God and perfect man, of rational soul and body, before the ages begotten of the Father according to Godhead, but in the last days (THE SELF-SAME) for us and our salvation, of Mary the Virgin; the self-same consubstantial with the Father according to Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to Manhood."

For John it is the Only-begotten Son of God Who has a double birth and a double consubstantiality, whereas for Theodoret these can be predicated only of Christ, Who includes the Logos, since only the single divine birth and consubstantiality can be predicated of the Logos Himself. It seems highly doubtful that Theodoret is the author of the formulary of reunion as is commonly claimed.³⁹ On occasion he may profess agreement with John's confession, but then he professed agreement with the Nicæan Creed also. On the basis of this crypto-Nestorianism Theodoret could continue his attacks on Ephesus and Cyril, and especially on the *Twelve Chapters*. It is very important to point out that Theodoret's Christology is not that of John accepted by Cyril, nor that of Leo's Tome and Chalcedon. Failure to realize this during the fifth century made both Leo and Chalcedon guilty by association

³⁷ P.G., 83, 280AB.

³⁸ Ep. CLI, P.G., 83, 1420A.

³⁹ Also doubtful on the basis of his Christology is Theodoret's alleged authorship of what seems to be a letter sent by Domnus to Flavian (P.G., 83, 1297). See R. V. Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon* (London, 1953), p. 28, n. 5) in which it is confessed that all things pertaining to Christ, although predicated of two natures, are attributed "to the One Only-Begotten."

in the eyes of those who followed the lead of Dioscoros, in the same way that Dioscoros was made guilty by association by his support of Eutyches.

Keeping in mind Theodoret's distinction between the titles Christ and the Only-begotten Son for the purpose of denying that the Nicaean Creed speaks of the Only-begotten Son Himself as born, suffering, crucified and buried, it is instructive to turn to Leo's Tome. The bishop of Rome, in clear contrast to Theodoret and Nestorius, writes, "that the Son of God is said to have been crucified and buried, although He suffered these things not in His Godhead itself, in virtue of which the Only-begotten is both co-eternal and consubstantial with the Father, but in the weakness of Human nature. And this is the reason why we all confess, too, in the Creed that 'the Only-begotten Son of God was crucified and buried' in accordance with that saying of the Apostle, 'For had they known they would not have crucified the Lord of Majesty'" (ch. 5). If this is not *in toto* what Cyril is saying in the *Twelfth Anathema* of his *Chapters*, it at least is certainly not what Nestorius or Theodoret were saying. In the opinion of this writer, Theodoret's acceptance of Leo's Tome in his need for help against personal disaster is no different from his acceptance of Cyril's *Twelve Chapters* at Chalcedon. He was a sorry sight at the eighth session trying to publicly convince the assembly that he was not now accepting all that was done and anathematizing Nestorius because of any love of honour, rank and wealth.⁴⁰

As long as Cyril and John were alive they were able to contain somewhat the extremists in their respective dioceses (*dioikeseis*). Even the eruption of the controversy over the Christology of Diodore and Theodore did not break up the union of 433. However, things changed for the worse with the accession of Domnos (443) to the "Apostolic See" of Antioch and Dioscoros (444) to the "Evangelical See" (so they are called in the minutes of the Councils) of Alexandria. Theodoret got the upper hand in Antioch and pro-Nestorian activities increased seriously. Evidently at Theodoret's instigation several Nestorians were ordained bishops, including the notorious Nestorian fanatic Count Irenaeus the twice married. Thus the Church was faced with a resurgence of a Nestorianism hiding behind the formulary of reunion and Theodoretan Christological double-talk. Again we must keep in

⁴⁰ *Mansi*, VII, 188-192.

mind that these people not only professed faith in the formulary of reunion, but also in the Nicene Creed, both of which they interpreted in their own way.

At the time Cyril accepted John's confession there were many who were highly suspicious of the two nature document, either feeling that Cyril had compromised the decisions of Ephesus or believing that Cyril had been tricked. They no doubt felt that now their suspicions had been justified. It was now natural for them to feel and decide that the only way to uproot this new Nestorianism was to insist on *One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate, One Nature after the Union*, and that Christ is *One from or out of two Natures*. Only this would make it possible to insure the attribution of all the names and activities of Christ to the Logos Incarnate. The Theodoretan type experience had proven to them beyond all doubt that any doctrine of two natures after the union could only mean two subjects and centres of activity in Christ acting in a harmony of wills, the one or the other performing its proper operations as the need arose. As we shall see he assailed even those who could accept *One Nature of the Logos Incarnate*, but who preferred to speak of *two Physeis* which to them meant *two ousiai*.

The opportunity for a decisive blow at two natures was presented by the Endemousa Synod of Constantinople in 448 which was convened to deal with the accusation of heresy filed against Eutyches by Eusebius of Dorylaeum. The libel itself contains no specific heresy, but according to the witness of those sent to invite Eutyches to attend the Council in order to answer to unnamed charges, the aged Archimandrite denied that Christ is consubstantial with us according to manhood.⁴¹ The same denial was repeated by Eutyches when he finally made a personal appearance at the Synod. However, when told that this is a denial of the teaching of the Fathers (perhaps some Patristic quotations were shown to him) he faltered and showed some willingness to accept this teaching. However, it is interesting to note that he was several times asked as one question what perhaps should have been asked as two separate questions, viz. whether or not he confesses (1) that Christ is consubstantial with us, and (2) that after the incarnation there are two natures in Christ.⁴² There seem to be no indi-

⁴¹ *Mansi*, VI, 700-701; 741.

⁴² *Mansi*, VI, 737; 808; 816.

cations from the minutes (except possibly in Leo's observation that no one reprimanded the monk when he spoke of *One Nature* after the union) that these two statements could have different meanings, viz. that it may be possible to speak of One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate or one nature after the union, and at the same time confess that Christ is consubstantial with us according to His Manhood. Thus, although Eutyches could seriously entertain the possibility of accepting the teaching on consubstantiality, he could not for a moment think of anathematizing those who teach One Nature after the union. Thus when the two questions were thrown at him as one he could only refuse to anathematize. It seems quite clear that for Eutyches (whose case seems to be one of simple ignorance), as well as for Eusebius and Flavian, *physis* was synonymous with *ousia*. Eutyches was excommunicated, but either during the Synod or later he appealed his case to the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Thessalonica.

Although Eutyches was quite defendable in his refusal to anathematize those who teach One Nature Incarnate of the Logos, since, as he said, he could not anathematize the Fathers of the Church, he could not be defended for his denial that Christ is consubstantial with us. Thus it was not after this Synod that Dioscoros accepted Eutyches into communion. This could not be done until the question of Christ's consubstantiality was cleared up. This doctrinal deficiency was done away with on the basis of added testimony presented to the Review Conferences of April 449 convened to examine Eutyches' claim that the acts of the Endymousa Synod which condemned him were inaccurate and lacking.

Presbyter John, who, together with the deacon Andrew (with another deacon, Athanasius, happening along), was sent to invite Eutyches to the Endemousa Synod, and had then testified that Eutyches denied that Christ is consubstantial with us, now claimed that in private, while the other two were not listening, the Archimandrite expressed his belief that *Christ is consubstantial with His mother*, although not with us.⁴⁸ When asked why this information was withheld in 448 Presbyter John answered that he had done this because the other two had not witnessed to this part of the conversation. The presbyter's testimony is peculiar since Eutyches did say that the mother of Christ was consubstantial with

⁴⁸ *Mansi*, vi, 785.

us.⁴⁴ If he believed that Christ was consubstantial with his mother, this would, as it seems, make Him consubstantial with us also. It is interesting to note that Flavian himself uses the phrase that Christ is consubstantial with His mother in his confessions of faith.⁴⁵

It is very important to realize that at this Review Conference it was established, truthfully or falsely, that Eutyches was excommunicated for refusing to anathematize those who say One Nature after the Union and for refusing to accept two natures after the Union. Constantine the deacon, one of Eutyches' advocates at the hearing, accused Flavian of doing just this.⁴⁶ The Patrician Florentius vigorously challenged the truthfulness of the acts which pictured him as attempting to get Eutyches to accept two natures after the union as though this only were Orthodox dogma.⁴⁷ There is also evidence indicating that on the basis of Cyril's *One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate* it was felt that Eutyches must agree with the bishops assembled.⁴⁸ This evidently meant that they felt Eutyches should accept a second nature in Christ since this is what to them *Incarnate* meant. Of course, this would be true if *Physis* meant *Ousia*, but this is not how Cyril used the term in this phrase. He could not and never does speak of *One Ousia of God the Logos Incarnate*. This paralleling of Cyril's *One Physis* with *Incarnate* in order to prove that Cyril speaks of *Two Physeis* in Christ was and is a mistake repeated by all Chalcedonians till today. The approach was and is a bad one since it could only lead to two *Hypostases* and *Prosopa*. Nevertheless, Eutyches was not restored to communion as a result of this Review Conference, either because Presbyter John's testimony was not accepted, or because Eutyches refused to accept two natures after the union.

What is of great significance from the foregoing is the fact that the Council of Ephesus of 449 was not heretical since Eutyches' exhortation was obviously based on his confession that Christ is consubstantial with His mother. This explains why Anatolius of Constantinople at the Fourth Ecumenical Council could in plenary session claim that Dioscoros was not deposed

⁴⁴ *Mansi*, v, 1233; vi, 741.

⁴⁵ Sellers, *op. cit.*, pp. 130-131.

⁴⁶ *Mansi*, vi, 808; 816.

⁴⁷ *Mansi*, vi, 808-809.

⁴⁸ *Mansi*, vi, 813.

for heresy.⁴⁹ The Ephesine Council of 449 was rejected at Chalcedon because of the injustice done to Flavian and Eusebius, and the exhortation of Eutyches. On the other hand Theodoret and Ibas, who were also deposed at Ephesus in 449, were restored at Chalcedon as late as sessions eight, nine, and ten, and then only after they accepted all that had thus far been done at the Council and anathematized Nestorius. Even though Leo's legates considered Theodoret as a participant from the very beginning,⁵⁰ the assembly vigorously protested.⁵¹ The result of the protest can be seen in that the imperial representatives informed the protesting Dioscoros that the bishop of Cyrus was admitted to the Council in the capacity of accuser only.⁵² We recounted his restoration elsewhere.⁵³ It should be noted that Atticos, the bishop of Nikopolis in Old Epirus, who made the motion which brought about the careful comparison of Leo's Tome with Cyril's *Twelve Chapters*, was present at Theodoret's restoration and the Epirot's acceptance of it is another testimony to the Bishop of Cyrus' submission to Cyril.⁵⁴

Another objection, and perhaps the most serious, which Chalcedonian Orthodox have with the Ephesine Council of 449 is its rejection of Cyril's allowance for two natures after the union and its one-sided exclusiveness in this regard. This comes out clearly in the fact that at the Flavian Synod of 448 the minutes of Ephesus were read and accepted⁵⁵ and also by the fact that both Flavian and Eusebius accepted *One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate* so long as Christ's consubstantiality with us is clearly professed.⁵⁶ However, Dioscoros simply rejected all talk of two natures after the union. When the imperial representatives asked why Flavian was deposed since he did accept *One Nature of the Logos Incarnate*, Eustathius of Berytus admitted making a mistake.⁵⁷ Dioscoros, however, claimed that Flavian contradicted himself by accepting two natures after the union.⁵⁸ The strange thing is that both

⁴⁹ *Mansi*, VII, 104.

⁵⁰ *Mansi*, V, 589.

⁵¹ *Mansi*, V, 592.

⁵² *Mansi*, V, 644-645.

⁵³ *Mansi*, VII, 188-192. See remarks in text of this article at note 19, page 89 above.

⁵⁴ *Mansi*, VII, 188.

⁵⁵ *Mansi*, VI, 665.

⁵⁶ *Mansi*, VI, 637; 676-677.

⁵⁷ *Mansi*, VI, 677.

⁵⁸ *Mansi*, VI, 681.

were correct, since for Flavian *physis* meant *ousia*, whereas for Dioscoros it meant *hypostasis*. Nevertheless, knowingly or not Dioscoros was bent on erasing what Cyril had done in 433.

In confronting Eutyches' denial that Christ is consubstantial with us Flavian and Eusebius were clearly speaking of two *physeis* as equivalent to two *ousiae*. For them double *consubstantiality* meant two natures. For Eutyches *physis* and *ousia* were also synonymous and he evidently at first believed that Cyril's *One Nature* meant *One Ousia*, hence his hesitation to accept them as names for Christ's humanity. Cyril does use *ousia* and *physis* as synonymous when speaking of the Holy Trinity.⁵⁹ There is no question of course about his use of *physis* as equivalent to *hypostasis*. Yet he never speaks of there being one *ousia* in Christ and clearly speaks of the flesh of Christ as being consubstantial with ours.⁶⁰ In Christology he uses *physis*, *hypostasis*, and *prosopon* as synonymous, yet he never, as far as I know, speaks of Two *Proso-pa before the union and one after*, as he does with the other two terms. Equivalent to his *One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate* is his *One Hypostasis of God the Logos Incarnate* of his *Third Letter to Nestorius*⁶¹ and his *Defense of the Twelve Chapters*.⁶² In the light of all this and all which was said at Chalcedon, the anathema pronounced in the definition on those who say two natures before the union and one after the union was intended for anyone with Eutyches who denied that Christ is consubstantial with us. There is no doubt that the definition should have contained the phrase or *ousia* as one finds after the phrase *one physis* in the eighth and ninth anathemas of the Fifth Ecumenical Council. This would have avoided much misunderstanding. It perhaps was not done at the Fourth because possibly Cyril's *One Nature of God the Logos* was taken as equivalent to *One Ousia* and the word *Incarnate* as equivalent to a second *ousia* or *physis*. That this was possible is borne out clearly by the Flavian Synod of 448, as well as the explanations given by both Eusebius and Flavian at Ephesus in 449, as we have already indicated.

It should be noted that *One Hypostasis of God the Logos Incarnate* and not *One Physis of God the Logos Incarnate* is to be

⁵⁹ E.g., *Ad Monachos*, P.G., 77, 17.

⁶⁰ Mansi, VI, 677.

⁶¹ P.G., 77, 116.

⁶² *Apologia Cap. II*, P.G., 76, 401A.

found in Cyril's *Third Letter to Nestorius* approved by Ephesus and Chalcedon. These terms are, of course, absolutely synonymous for Cyril. Yet it seems very obvious that at the Flavian Synod of 448 and at Chalcedon, the true Cyrillian meaning or usage of *One Nature* was overlooked simply because the phrase *One Nature after the union* was not contained in the synodical letters of Cyril which alone were familiar to all participants of both Councils.

At the Endemousa Synod of Constantinople in 448⁶³ and in his confession of faith of 449 Flavian says that Christ is *out of or from two natures*.⁶⁴ Yet he spoke in the same breath of two natures after the union. At the Council of Chalcedon Dioscoros vigorously rejected any talk of a *union of two natures* (as found in the formulary of reunion approved by Cyril) and insisted exclusively on a *union out of or from two natures*. For Dioscoros this meant that after the union there could be only one nature. Had this term had the same function for Flavian as it did for Dioscoros, the bishop of New Rome would have found himself believing with Eutyches in *one ousia after the union*, since for him *physis* meant *ousia*. Nevertheless, the imperial representatives were so impressed by the fuss Dioscoros made over this question, that they used this as an example to convince the bishops of the need of drafting a statement of faith. It is at this point that Anatolius intervened to remind the assembly that Dioscoros was not deposed for heresy, but because he excommunicated Leo.⁶⁵ In their interlocution at the fifth session the imperial representatives said that Leo says *union of two natures* whereas Dioscoros says *union out of two natures*. "Whom do you follow?" they asked. The Reverend Bishops cried, "As Leo, thus we believe. Those who gainsay are Eutychinists."⁶⁶ In the light of what happened in sessions two and four with Leo's Tome, one wonders if a deliberate attempt was made with the minutes to make Leo look a little better at Chalcedon in order to offset the obvious humiliation he underwent. Keeping in mind the Council's subordination of Leo to Cyril one must take seriously the fact that in the letters of Cyril which served as the basis of the Council's deliberations the terms *from two natures* or *from two One* occur several times. It is understandable that Dioscoros made this a big issue and it so became sub-

⁶³ Mansi, vi, 680.

⁶⁴ Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

⁶⁵ Mansi, vii, 104.

⁶⁶ Mansi, vii, 105.

sequently. One can understand the imperial representatives trying to make the question look like a big victory for Leo. Attila had to be met by the force of an empire united in everything and especially helpful was the bishop of Rome who must not now be humiliated. But even when in *two natures* is accepted as the original reading of the Chalcedonian definition (although from *two natures* is what the manuscripts contain), it should be taken as an anti-Eutychianist statement meaning in *two ousiai*, since this is what had been denied. Thus the Fifth Ecumenical Council rejects as heretical from *two natures* only when its proponents mean to teach *one ousia* in Christ. It stands to reason that had anyone proposed in *two natures* in the sense of rejecting Cyril's from *two natures* he would have certainly been challenged. Anatolius' reply to the imperial representatives is indicative of the fact that the leaders of the Council were not in any mood to see in these phrases any contradiction, and in fact there were none. Would the non-Chalcedonian say that Christ is *out of two ousiai* in the same way he says *out of two physeis*? If not then he can't expect a Chalcedonian to do what he won't. What is then left is to speak of Christ as of *two ousiai* or in *two ousiai*. This is all a Chalcedonian means by of *two natures* and in *two natures*. It seems that bickering over such terms was the result of a heresy hunting temper which lumped Leo and Theodoret into one theological camp because of the alliance between them.

Also one may point out that *hypostatic union* or *natural union* were accepted at Chalcedon by virtue of the fact that all done at Ephesus in 431, the most important part of which are Cyril's letters wherein are contained all his key terms and ideas on Christology, was incorporated together with Cyril's letter to John and the Tome of Leo into the definition itself. It seems obvious enough that the Chalcedonian theologians of the fifth and sixth centuries should be taken very seriously when they point out that Chalcedon was not convened in order to condemn Nestorius, except by way of repeating what had been done so well at Ephesus in 431, but rather in order to deal with the Eutychianist heresy.

The Theodoretan crypto-Nestorianism, whose danger loomed so large in Alexandrian circles, was not at all grasped by Leo. In a similar fashion the danger of Eutychianism was not handled properly by Dioscoros. We must always keep in mind the serious imbalance of attitudes toward issues on each side. While the Chalcedonians concentrated on the *confusors of the ousiai* in

Christ, the Alexandrians were still fighting the *separators of natures or hypostases*. In the light of this it would be wise to make allowances in terminology while none whatsoever in faith. I would suggest that serious consideration be given to the Fifth Ecumenical Council, not as one which modified Chalcedon, but as one which interprets it correctly. If we agree on the meaning of Cyril's Christology, we should also be as pliable as he on terms. In this regard the non-Chalcedonians should accept all of Cyril, including 433, and the Chalcedonians must stop overemphasizing the Cyril of 433.

DISCUSSION: Concerning the Paper of Father Romanides

FATHER MEYENDORFF: I am glad that Father Romanides speaks this time in this positive way about the Tome of Leo, and I hope the non-Chalcedonians will read him in this light. The praises of Leo in the Acts of Chalcedon should be seen as a conciliatory move in the light of the anti-Roman bias of the Chalcedonian Canons.

FATHER ROMANIDES: It is my opinion that the adoption of Trinitarian terms in Christology was in the beginning rather accidental. At the Council of Alexandria in 362, presided over by St. Athanasius the Great, it was decided to adopt the Cappadocian manner of distinguishing between *hypostasis* and *ousia* when speaking about the Holy Trinity. No decision was made concerning the term *physis* which, until the Cappadocian distinction came into existence, was synonymous for all practical purposes with both *hypostasis* and *ousia*. The outcome of this was that the Cappadocian tradition ended up by equating *physis* with *ousia*, while the Alexandrian tradition equated *physis* with *hypostasis*. The accidental nature of this equating of *physis* with either *hypostasis* or *ousia* must be taken seriously into consideration in order to understand the history of the Christological debates between 448 and 451 as described in my paper. In the self-justifying heat of polemics after 451 each side claimed a monopoly of understanding of the precise meaning of the term *physis* which from the point of view of the history of dogma is untenable. Failure to realize this can only lead us back to the ridiculous debate concerning the superiority of one's own Fathers over the Fathers of the other side. We must be very clear about the fact that the Chalcedonians mean two *ousiai* when they speak of two *physeis* after the union, whereas the non-Chalcedonians, as pointed out very clearly by Father Samuel's paper also, do not mean *one ousia* when they speak of *one physis* after the union.

FATHER MEYENDORFF: *Physis* was seen by all as signifying concrete being. The Antiochene Christology insisted upon the idea that the concrete actions of Christ can be variously ascribed to humanity and divinity, the subject being one — the Christ.

FATHER ROMANIDES: But Cyril would attribute everything to the Lo-

gos in the flesh, not simply to the Christ as is done by the Nestorianizers and pointed out in my paper.

FATHER VERGHESE: What do we mean by Christ being in two *ousiai* after the union?

FATHER ROMANIDES: In both the Cappadocian and Alexandrian traditions the *ousia* of God is beyond all categories of thought in a radical manner and therefore not only beyond definition of any kind, but also beyond the predication of any name whatsoever, to such an extent that God is *hyper-onymos*, *hyper-ousios* and even *hyper-theos*. Within this Biblical tradition the *ousia* of man also remains a mystery. Only the energies and powers of both God and man can be known. In this sense the term *ousia* is used not in the Greek philosophical sense of the definable and knowable immutable inner reality of a thing, but as concrete unknowable reality known only in its acts. In contrast to the Antiochene and Latin tradition (the Augustinian one), the term *ousia* as applied to the Holy Trinity by the Cappadocian and Alexandrian Fathers is neither a platonic superstratal genus, nor an Aristotelian substratal material in which the hypostases or persons of the Holy Trinity participate. Therefore, Christ being in two *ousiai* could only mean that our Lord, the Only-Begotten Son of God, exists in two concrete, yet undefinable and perfect and complete realities, each of which is by nature proper to Himself and distinguishable in the union in thought alone. The term *in two natures* is of Latin provenance and was translated by the Cappadocian oriented Fathers of Chalcedon by the phrase *in two physis*. Under more normal conditions the Alexandrians might have accepted the term in their own theological language as *in two ousiai*. It is only in this anti-Eutychian sense that the non-Chalcedonians must understand the term *in two physis* whose only intent is to preclude *one ousia* after the union.

FATHER SAMUEL: I am quite pleased with this paper of Father Romanides from several points of view. First, I am pleasantly surprised that Theodoret is not defended by the paper. Secondly, Ephesus (449) is not condemned outright. The paper is much fairer at this point than most Western church historians. Some difficulties remain for anyone reading the minutes of the Council. They do not give me the same impression as they give Father Romanides. Take, for instance, the Third Letter of Cyril to Nestorius with the Twelve Anathemas. At Chalcedon it was not read. The imperial commissioners referred to the two canonical letters of Cyril read and approved at Ephesus in 431. But the letters of Cyril read at Chalcedon were only his Second Letter to Nestorius and his Letter to John of Antioch, or the Formulary of Reunion of 433. So from the point of view of reading, the Third Letter with the Anathemas was passed over in silence. There were two references to it at Chalcedon. One: the intervention of Atticus of Nicopolis who wanted to compare the Tome of Leo with the Twelve Anathemas. And two, the Chalcedonian Formula includes it, by implication, among the documents of the Faith.

How, then, can Father Romanides say that the Twelve Chapters of Cyril were in the mind of the Council when it accepted the Tome of Leo?

FATHER ROMANIDES: Father Samuel is correct in saying that the *Third Letter* of St. Cyril to Nestorius containing the *Twelve Chapters* was at first passed over in silence. However, after the reading of Leo's *Tome* the suc-

cessful demand was made that it be compared with the *Twelve Chapters* of St. Cyril in order to see whether or not it was Orthodox. We should not overlook the fact that the overwhelming majority of bishops at Chalcedon were Cyrillians and so were able to force the issue of the *Twelve Chapters* as the criterion of Leo's faith. After Chalcedon even Leo attempted to calm his enemies with the claim that he himself was absolutely Cyrillian (see e.g. his Ep. cxvii, 3). I think one should simply check the references to the minutes in my paper for documentation of the evaluations made.

FATHER SAMUEL: I am glad to hear you say that the *Twelve Chapters* were accepted by Chalcedon, though this is far from clear in the minutes.

In the matter of Ibās, for instance, the Roman delegates said that they had read his letter to Maris the Persian and that in spite of it they considered him Orthodox.

FATHER ROMANIDES: But Ibās was reinstated on the basis of his formal acceptance, sincere or not, of the *Twelve Chapters*.

FATHER SAMUEL: Besides, if I may continue, there is no basis for the statement that Dioscorus accepted Eutyches into communion if by this a serious charge is intended to be made against Dioscorus. There are several difficulties here. In the first place, we have to clarify the meaning of the word "communion" or *koinonia*. It can mean either Eucharistic communion or simply friendship and support. What is to be proved, if it can be raised as a charge, is that between the Home Synod of Constantinople in 448 and the second Council of Ephesus in 449 Dioscorus offered Eutyches Eucharistic communion. Do we have any evidence for it? Secondly, in none of the petitions against Dioscorus presented to the Council of Chalcedon was this mentioned. The only reference to it is found in the declaration against Dioscorus made by the Roman delegation. They said that Dioscorus had offered *koinonia* to Eutyches before the latter was rehabilitated at Ephesus in 449, without specifying what they meant by the word *koinonia*. Thirdly, while stating why Dioscorus had been condemned, Anatolius of Constantinople did not mention this as a charge against Dioscorus. Thus if at all one has to take the words of the Roman delegation seriously, they mean only that Dioscorus supported Eutyches.

But we appreciate your paper and its general trend.

FATHER ROMANIDES: In this regard the only point I wish to make in my paper is that Dioscorus supported Eutyches as one who accepts the double consubstantiality of the Only-Begotten Son of God. Only this can explain why Dioscorus' Orthodoxy was upheld at Chalcedon. On the other hand, Dioscorus was deposed for excommunicating Leo and also for acting uncanonically. I was not concerned specifically with the type of support Eutyches received from Dioscorus, although this is in itself of great importance.

BISHOP SARKISSIAN: In our new effort which aims at a deeper and more adequate understanding of the Council of Chalcedon than what we have been accustomed to in the past, we must not overlook the whole emotional, psychological climate in which the Council evolved and the political factors and tensions which were operative elements in the course of the Council. As the great majority of the bishops were Cyrillians in

their theological thinking, it was strange that the Tome of Leo was taken as a standard formulation of Christology. There are several other aspects in the minutes of the Council which need to be taken into consideration in a well-balanced presentation and evaluation of the spirit and the content of the Council. In this paper, some important aspects, such as the role of Leo's Tome, the rehabilitation of Theodoret and Ibas are overlooked and only the positive elements and aspects have been taken into account. We need a fuller evaluation of the Council as a historical event.

FATHER ROMANIDES: I am surprised at some of the claims of oversight, since much of my paper is devoted to the role of Leo's Tome, the Christology of Theodoret and its relation to Leo's Christology, and the manner in which Theodoret and Ibas were rehabilitated at Chalcedon. I am also amazed that at this point in our conversations Leo's Tome is still referred to as "a standard formulation of Christology" at Chalcedon. It is easy for you to use the Latin interpretation of Chalcedon as a stick against us, but if we are to get anywhere you will have to take the Greek Chalcedonian interpretation of the place of Leo's Tome at the Fourth Council more seriously.

DR. KHELLA: In interpreting the Acts of Chalcedon it is unrealistic to expect agreement on our two sides. This paper is historically more or less accurate in what it says, but the data have been chosen from a particular perspective. As Bishop Sarkissian said, we need a more balanced study of the Acts. As for a few inaccuracies, e.g. on page 83, it is not true to say that Severus was the first to agree on two natures "in thought." Timothy Aelurus was just as correct in this regard, also Peter the Iberian and others. On pages 87-90, I feel that the role of Leo at Chalcedon should be clarified. The numbers given of bishops at Chalcedon are often legendary. Perhaps there were more than 360 bishops in fact, of whom only 7 were from the West. Two North Africans who were fleeing from the invasions were by accident at Chalcedon. There was also the Apocrisarius of Leo in Constantinople. Two others from the West spoke no Greek. These were the ones who wanted the Tome of Leo to be read.

The letter was read in a smaller committee in which only 23 bishops were present. Latin Acts have different numbers from the Greek Acts; but the Tome was not read in the second session. The session of 13th October is difficult to regard as a full session.

FATHER BOROVY: I was afraid of this entry into the jungle of details from which there may be no easy way out. I wanted rather to count on my fingers the achievements of this day. Father Meyendorff's last two points in his paper are a definite achievement. When I heard Father Samuel saying "we are not monophysites," this was another achievement. When Bishop Sarkissian spoke of the *communicatio idiomatum* this was another achievement again. When finally I heard Professor Karmiris I felt we were very close to each other. It seems we should be able on this basis to find a uniting formula. Perhaps we are too enthusiastic and we should speak a little bit as Professor Florovsky did (as *advocatus diabolus*). I would continue in that negative line. Is there a dialogue here, or a dual monologue? We sincerely accept the defense of our non-Chalcedonian brethren for their past. Our side can also present a similar defense. If we take this line,

the next step will be polemics. We say we are individual theologians. I do not consider myself as such. My Church sent me here to speak on her behalf — not for polemics, but for unity. I am here to find the common ground as suggested in Professor Karmiris' paper. All contributions on the Chalcedonian side bear an ecumenical spirit. They seek a meeting point, and even perhaps went further. The spirit of Cyril is strong. We are not against him. But we are the Church, but not the church of Cyril or Leo or Theodoret or anybody else. The Church is above them all. We need not accept everything of Cyril. His fundamental Christology is important; but no need to reject Leo and Theodoret in their positive contributions.

Historically, we should not seek to defend our own sides. History has no angels of light, nor purely dark devils. In history we find men acting, holy men, to be sure, but still men. Even in Nestorius there are many positive aspects. We must recognize both the merit and the weakness of both sides. The Holy Spirit works in the Church as a whole.

We must look for the ground of unity. The details can be worked out by a commission.

PROFESSOR ROMANIDES: There is no doubt, as Bishop Sarkissian and Professor Khella point out, that my paper is written from a certain point of view. It only happens that this point of view is that of the overwhelming majority of the Council which accepted Leo's Tome only in the light of St. Cyril's *Twelve Chapters*. That this should be the normal outcome at Chalcedon cannot be surprising when one takes seriously the historical fact that the Latins and Antiochenes, who were the only ones who unconditionally supported the Tome, were a small minority at the Council.

I am very happy to hear that Severus was not the first one on the non-Chalcedonian side who could accept *two natures tei theorai monei after the union*. There are no indications from the minutes of the Ephesine Council of 449 that Dioscoros could accept this. Nevertheless, I should like to point out that I was not asked to write a book on Chalcedon, but only ten pages which became seventeen. The purpose of the paper did not include any discussion of such technical problems concerning the number of sessions, bishops, etc. I cannot accept the idea that Session II could have debated Leo's Tome without it having first been read. The cruciality of the debate over Leo's Tome at Session II can be seen in the fact that the bishops were given five days in which to examine St. Leo's faith in the light of St. Cyril's *Twelve Chapters*. Session IV continued the discussion and the acceptance of Leo's Tome only in the light of St. Cyril is clearly seen in the recorded opinions of the bishops and reflected in the Chalcedonian definition itself. These are incontrovertible facts and no manipulation of the minutes can mitigate their importance.

I think a very basic difficulty which we Chalcedonians of the Greek tradition face is that there is a peculiar theological alliance between the Latin (including Protestant) and non-Chalcedonian scholars in regard to Chalcedon. For the same reasons that the Westerners can accept Chalcedon, the non-Chalcedonians reject Chalcedon. Both sides try to prove that Chalcedon rejected the *Twelve Chapters* of St. Cyril and accepted Leo's Tome either as a correction (so say the Westerners) or as a distortion (so say the non-Chalcedonians) of Cyrilian Christology. Con-

trary to both these approaches (which do not represent the central tradition of Chalcedon) the Chalcedonian Greeks read the documents of Chalcedon in the light of Ephesus I (431) and Constantinople II (553). The usual Latin and non-Chalcedonian picture whereby our Illyrian, Thracian, Asian, Pontian, Cappadocian, Palestinian, and Egyptian Fathers are presented as capitulating before a few Latin and Antiochene bishops is caricature and not history.

In regard to the welcome remarks of Father Borovoy I would like to add that my paper is not a defense of Chalcedon, whose shortcomings I try to indicate, nor is it a defense of the non-Chalcedonian position. Rather it is an attempt to understand how the two traditions survived the complexities of history while always maintaining essentially the same Orthodox faith. Such a study so obviously calls for the tracing in history of the common central intuition of faith and doctrine which could not be distorted by the tragedies of our respective histories. This fact is living testimony to the meaning of continuity in truth which is not imposed by any external authority but which is the fruit of communion with the source of truth. To try to avoid the complexities of history when dealing with each other can lead only to a false sentimentalism which can never and will never lead to unity and can be no more effective than an ostrich burying her head in the earth to solve her immediate problems. Whether we like it or not we are christologically the Church of Cyril because Cyril's Christology is that of the Bible, the Fathers, and the Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Ecumenical Councils. The anti-Cyrillian works of Theodoret on Christology were condemned by the Fifth Ecumenical Council and Leo's Tome was never accepted as a definition of faith. Cyril's *Twelve Chapters* are definitions of faith.

August 13th, 1964, Evening Session.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON OF CHRIST IN THE ARMENIAN CHURCH

A BRIEF SURVEY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE UNION OF THE TWO NATURES

By BISHOP KAREKIN SARKISSIAN

Speaking about the historical experience of the Armenian people, Henri Gregoire, the highly renowned Belgian Byzantinist, says: "*la querelle des deux natures en Jesus-Christ fut sa tragédie.*"¹ For more than one reason, this statement can be extended to the whole Christian East. Bitter controversies, mutual accusations of heresy followed by anathemas, harmful enmities and disastrous persecutions have affected our past history to a point where we have lost the clear understanding of our respective attitudes towards Christology, and all our relationships in history have been marked with a strong trend of polemics which, at its best, resulted in the recognition of certain formulae as absolute and, therefore, unchangeable at any cost.

If our present ecumenical era, with its new spirit of openness towards each other, will not open our eyes to new visions and a new and deeper understanding of our respective positions, then, indeed, we must confess that we have lost a God-given opportunity for a new witness to the unity and mission of the Church to which we have the firm consciousness of belonging together.

It is in this spirit of a fresh approach to our respective attitudes that I would like to set forth as clearly as possible the fundamental positions of the Armenian Church in the past by offering to your consideration and evaluation some statements of genuine authority within the Armenian Church with regard to the understanding of the unity of the Two Natures in Christ.

First of all, let us begin with a confessional statement which enjoys the highest authority in the Armenian Church as it is always publicly professed by candidates for the Holy Orders at the Ordination and Consecration Services.

¹ Sirapie Der Nersessian, *Armenia and the Byzantine Empire* (Cambridge, Mass., 1947), Preface, p. xix.

"We believe that One of the Three Persons, God the Word, begotten of the Father before the ages, in time descended in the Virgin Mary, the Theotokos, took of her blood (i.e. substance) and united it with His Godhead; for nine months He waited in the womb of the Immaculate Virgin and (thus) the perfect God became perfect man with soul, spirit and flesh. One person, one prosopon and one united nature: God became man without undergoing change and alteration, He was conceived without human seed and was born immaculate. As there is no beginning for His Godhead, so there is no end for his manhood. (For Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today, and the same for ever.)

"We believe that our Lord Jesus Christ walked about on the earth. At the age of thirty years He came to be baptized. The Father bore witness from above by saying: 'This is my beloved son,' and the Holy Spirit in the likeness of a dove descended upon Him. He was tempted by Satan but overcame him. He preached salvation to men. He laboured bodily and underwent fatigue, hunger and thirst. Then He voluntarily suffered, was crucified and died bodily and remained alive through His Godhead. The body was placed in the tomb being united with the Godhead; by the soul He descended into hell with the unseparable Godhead."²

Our purpose will be to try to show how this understanding of the doctrine of the person of Christ was reached. But, at this juncture, a historical fact must be taken into account before any doctrinal inquiry and analysis.

Now, it must be accepted that the Armenian Church did not react to the Council of Chalcedon only upon the instigation and under the influence of the Syrians in the beginning of the sixth century. Nor were they misled because of the deficiency of their language in its capacity to render correctly the subtleties of the Greek expressions. Neither did they exploit the doctrinal issues for purely political and nationalistic purposes. In fact, they dealt with the Council of Chalcedon on doctrinal ground, and as early as the fifth century, as will be shown now.

We are in possession of two doctrinal documents of the fifth

² See the *Book of Daily Offices*, where this Confession appears always on the first page.

century which make it clear how the Armenian Church understood the union of the Two Natures.

1) The first document is a treatise ascribed to Moses of Khoren or Khorenatsi, the famous Armenian historiographer.³ Speaking against those who separate Christ in two, he asserts very strongly the idea of unity right from the beginning by saying that it is possible for *many* elements to join together and to be united in *one* nature. Man is composed of earthly and spiritual elements, but he has one nature. The two are not confused in him; that is to say, the flesh is not soul and the soul is not flesh. Each maintains its own properties. The distinctness of the two is not destroyed by their union. Likewise, the Incarnation also must be understood in the same manner. We must confess Christ One in His nature because it is said "the Word became flesh" and that "He took the form of a servant." The meaning of the Scriptures is clear: that which was taken by the Word was that which He did not have. Therefore, the two, the Word and the flesh, which were separate before the Incarnation, became one after the Incarnation.

Arguing against those who consider the union of the *Two Natures* impossible, he says that they have no right to assert the unity of the *persons*.⁴

"It is said (in the Scriptures) 'He who was in the form of God took the form of a Servant.' You see, it says form *and* form; which form is then absorbed in the mixture according to their confession? For (if they think that) the union of the whole results in confusion, then they have to understand the same for the *persons*. Indeed, their sayings are ridiculous . . . because, as in the legendary tales, they create one head and two tails!"⁵

He urges his opponents to give up their separatist attitude and confess the union of the Two Natures or to deny altogether the whole Incarnation.

³ The authenticity of this attribution is well assessed nowadays on scholarly ground.

⁴ The Armenian word is "demk" which generally corresponds to *prosopon*. Here, however, it stands for *hypostasis*, because obviously in this passage Khorenatsi tries to show that for those who say *Two Natures in One Person* this latter expression becomes an empty notion if its authors cannot conceive a unity in nature.

⁵ See *Book of Letters* (Tiflis, 1901), pp. 24-25.

It is not difficult to detect the influence of the Alexandrian theological tradition all through the text of the whole treatise.

2) The second document, which is a longer exposition than Khorenatsi's treatise and which deals with the subject on biblical and theological ground, rather than philosophical as was the case in the previous document, comes to us from St. John Mandakouni, a fifth century Church Father whose treatise is written in a remarkably pastoral and eirenetical spirit.

This is an attempt "*to demonstrate*," as the title itself suggests so pointedly, why it is right to confess the Saviour "*of two natures*" (*ek duo physeon*) or "*one nature*" (*mia physis*). There is no place here for the least doubt that the doctrine of the Council of Chalcedon is directly aimed at in this treatise.

Here, again, we find a strong plea for maintaining firm the unity of the Two Natures in Christ the "how" of which remains above our human understanding.

There are two points which he refutes categorically: The first is the very idea of union as understood by those who in fact separate Christ in two. For him the union is a genuinely real one and not a sheer principle of union or simply an indwelling of the Word in the flesh. "Some consider that the descending (the Incarnation) was in appearance and not in truth." They believe that Christ became man in the sense that He inhabited the flesh by "complaisance and will."⁶

Here, in fact, he attacks the ideas propounded in the name of Theodore of Mopsuestia who was much more influential in the bordering countries of Armenia, the Syriac-speaking Christian world, than Nestorius or any other Antiochene theologian.

For him Christ assumed the human nature in its integral reality and united it to Himself inseparably and thus made it *His own*.

Secondly, he criticizes the Dyophysite position for its dualistic interpretation of Christ's life on the earth. The distinctness of the Two Natures has led the dyophysite thinkers so far as to give each *nature* the meaning of a *person*. It is this *hypostasized* understanding of Christ's natures, as the Tome of Leo formulates it so sharply, that has always been fiercely opposed by the non-Chalcedonians.

Mandakouni's interpretation of the Dyophysite position goes

⁶ *Book of Letters*, p. 33.

as far as to see in it the teaching not of two *persons*, but of two *individuals* in Christ. Thus, he compares the two Natures to Peter and John walking along in the same direction, but on parallel roads. Commenting on John 10:30, 14:9-10, he says:

"You see, He reveals Himself as an image, a ray shone out for us from the light. He never speaks of the two persons as going side by side or as walking on parallel roads each being distinct from one another, such as Peter and John travelling side by side to the same end."⁷

Obviously, this is an exaggeration of the Chalcedonian understanding of Christ's natures. However, it is also an eloquent testimony to the kind of interpretation in which the dualistic conception — the stress put on the Two Natures — has been the stumbling block for the non-Chalcedonians.

But the core of Mandakouni's thinking is to be found in the following passage:

"God the Word took flesh and became man; thus, He united to Himself, in God-fitting manner, the body of our lowliness, the whole soul and flesh; and the flesh truly became the flesh of the Word God. In virtue of this it is said of the Invisible that He is seen, of the Intangible that He is felt, crucified, buried and risen on the third day. For He Himself was both the passible and impassible, the mortal who received death. Otherwise, how could the Lord of Glory have been crucified? This is like the body which is formed of many members, although these latter have not the same function. For the soul in itself does not suffer any wounding, neither the flesh affliction, and the Word is incapable of both. But in everything He is the one who suffers and the one who is impassible, and because of that he is said to be man and God by having the definition of '*God Incarnate*'. "⁸

The union has such an intimate character that through the act of the Incarnation "The Word is the Word of the flesh and the flesh is the flesh of the word."⁹

⁷ *Book of Letters*, pp. 36-37.

⁸ *Book of Letters*, pp. 36-37.

⁹ One can easily recognize in this expression a striking similarity with St. Cyril's 11th Anathema which runs as follows: "If anyone does not confess the flesh of our Lord to be life-giving and *the own flesh of the Word Himself* conjoined to Him in dignity, or having a more divine indwelling,

These two fifth-century documents are sufficient to give us a clue to the way of christological thinking in which the Armenian Church was engaged in the last quarter of the fifth century.¹⁰ In these two documents we are given an idea about the doctrinal basis upon which the Armenian Church took its official stand vis-à-vis the Council of Chalcedon in the beginning of the sixth century (506/8).

To confess Christ "*One Nature*" or "*Two Natures*" was the fundamental principle which guided the later theologians in their expositions of the doctrine of Christ's person as well as in their defense, through polemical writings, of this Christology which they cherished wholeheartedly all along their history.

During the subsequent centuries, the position of the Armenian Church remained unchanged. The heads of the Church as well as the Church divines (i.e. the vardapets) suspected Chalcedon on the grounds of its dualistic conception of Christ's person always being associated with the teaching of Nestorius.

It would take me too far if I tried to present the later stages of the Armenian position in detail. Therefore, I would confine my presentation to some cases where the Armenian Church leaders and theologians were engaged in correspondence with the Greek Church Fathers and, thus, the Armenian theologians were prompted to present the teaching of their church in the context of an *encounter* as is the case of our present consultations.¹¹

and not rather life-giving, as we affirm, because it became the own flesh of the Word who had strength to quicken all things, be he anathema." T. H. Bindly, *The Oecumenical Documents of Faith*, p. 215, fourth edition (London, 1950). See the Greek text, *ibid.*, pp. 114-115; the Armenian version in *Book of Letters*, p. 405.

¹⁰ It must be noted also that the translation into Armenian of Timothy Aeluros' *Refutation of the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo* (480-484) gave a strong move to the Armenian theologians in their fight against the Council of Chalcedon.

¹¹ We have a most valuable symposium of doctrinal letters exchanged between the Armenian Church Fathers and the Leaders of other churches, such as the Greek, Syrian and Gregorian Fathers. It is called *The Book of Letters*, to which we have frequently referred in the previous pages of this paper. The basic document for our inquiry will be this Collection of Letters. There are several other writings of Armenian theologians dealing specifically with the Council of Chalcedon and its christological teaching. But I felt that a thorough study of them would mean to make this exposition a very long treatise, which is not in its right place in the immediate purpose of this consultation.

1) In answering a letter sent by Photius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, to the Armenian Catholicos, Zacharia (855-877), Vardapet Sahag, surnamed "Meroud," deals at a considerable length with the problem of the union of the Two Natures.¹²

To Photius' invitation to the Armenians to accept the council of Chalcedon as the Fourth Ecumenical Council, he answers:

"Our Fathers rejected the Council of Chalcedon and preached Christ the Son to the world as 'One of Two Natures' united without confusion and without separation. They (i.e. the Chalcedonians) divided Him in two natures and operations and wills, thus following the Nestorian false teachings. But they describe Him also as united in order to win the simple-minded by showing them that they were far away from the Nestorian heresy." (p. 284)

What is that unity which the Chalcedonians have in mind? The unity of the *person*. But Vardapet Sahag, together with all the Armenian theologians, finds absurd this unity of *person* without the unity of the *nature*. That idea of unity, in his reckoning, is a clever and disguised escape from the Nestorian teaching which the Chalcedonians condemn by name. It is with this view that he collates passages from Nestorius and Pope Leo in order to show the affinity of their respective christological doctrines.

"What communion there exists between Chalcedon and Cyril?" asks Sahag. "For the latter said 'One united Nature of Two,' according to the Holy Council of Ephesus (431). Chalcedon decreed two separate natures." (pp. 285-286)

He goes on to explain the unity:

"Let us take as an example the man; it is to him that is attributed what belongs to the body and what is possible for the soul. But man is never said 'Two Natures,' but 'One.' But if one still goes on opposing (the union of the natures in Christ) and saying 'Two Natures' for Christ, in fact one is asserting *three* natures: two human and one divine. Now, which of the three do they eliminate when they say 'Two Natures'? If they have in mind the body, then they are Eutychians; if the human soul, then they are Apollinarians; and if the divine, then they are like the Jews who said: 'You, being a man, make yourself God' (John 10:33)." (p. 287)

¹² See *Book of Letters*, pp. 283-294.

He aims specifically at the Chalcedonian definition when he says:

"The Council of Chalcedon said 'One Person and Two Natures in Christ' in order not to ascribe to God the Word the sufferings. This is ridiculous. For it was on the same point that the impious Nestorius erred when he opposed the Great Cyril." (p. 290)

And in order to show how the union was intimate he brings forth the example of the gold put in fire.

Again he argues against those who affirm that the natures are separated and the persons are united:

"For, if the union of the natures results in confusion, as they say, the same then must happen to the persons which they say to be one. For, the Apostle writes 'two persons': 'Though He was in the form of God . . . He took the form of a servant' (Philip. 2:6).¹⁸ Now, which of the two persons they are inclined to eliminate as they say one; for, if the one that is eliminated is God's person then they fall in the heresy of Sabellius; and if it is the man's person, how then could they see the Lord in the true form of man? Therefore, either the person is one in virtue of the union without confusion, as it truly is — and consequently, one has to accept the union of the two natures without confusion — or by dividing the natures divided will be said also the persons which no one of those who understand rightly the meaning of persons would accept and would dare say two perfect persons in one form. In fact, these people by saying two natures, two operations, two wills and two persons, understand two perfect and distinct persons according to the false teaching of Nestorius." (p. 291)

2) Again, in another correspondence which took place in the 10th century between Theodore, the Greek Metropolitan of Melitene, and Khatchig, the Armenian Catholicos, we find the same type of arguments put forward against the Council of Chalcedon and, particularly, against the formula of Two Natures. This time

¹⁸ The Armenian word is "kelb" (= a certain mode of being). The Greek word is *morphe*, implying essential character. It suggests unchangeableness, as contrasted to *schema* (= figure, fashion). In this passage the reference is to the pre-Incarnate Christ with divine attributes.

another theologian, by the name of Samuel, drafted the answer letter in the name of the Catholicos. He says:

"We do not agree with the new teaching of the Council of Chalcedon and of the Tome of Leo which state two natures in God the Word Incarnate. We confess Christ not God alone, neither man alone, and not God and man separated one from the other, but 'God made man.' And as He is Only-Begotten Son of the Father, so also He is the Only-born of the mother, One Son; and as One Son, one Christ; and as One Christ, One person; and as One Person, one prosopon; and as one prosopon, one will; and as one will, also one operation; and as one operation, one nature; as He truly is: *One Nature*.

"Therefore, if they divide the natures, divided will be also the others; for, nothing else is the human nature than will, operation, person, prosopon, that is to say, the perfect man. If different is the nature of the flesh and unmixable with the Word, then different is also the will of the nature and different is the operation of the will. Again they fall in the heresy of Nestorius. . . . If the early Church Fathers in their fight against the heresies sometimes referred to the traces of the natures (in Christ's life) it was only for assessing the economy, that is to say, that the Word of God truly became man and endured all things (i.e. human experiences) through His body. But in no time did they draw a rule of faith asserting the 'Two Natures.' But the Fathers assembled at Chalcedon consenting with Leo openly decreed a rule of faith asserting two separate natures. Thus, they sinned, because earlier they had said in the second Council of Ephesus: 'If anyone says for the One Christ Two Natures,' let him be anathema.' "¹⁴

In order to explain the character of the union, the author brings forth the following analogy: The union, he says, must not be conceived as "One and one which have come together with the same dignity, but like a harp with the harper to whom is united in concord the movement of its will; or like the light of a lamp which is united with the rays of the sun and which cannot be separated from them and cannot shine forth with the distinct rays of its own. Likewise, the human essence united with the divine insepa-

¹⁴ *Book of Letters*, pp. 310, 314.

rably, does not operate separately according to its own power. For, the stronger overcomes the weaker by uniting it to itself and divinizing it.”¹⁵

I could go on along this line by bringing forth many other passages taken from the Armenian Church Fathers and doctrinal statements. But I think it is sufficient for our immediate purpose to stop here and to consider the implications of the views expressed in the passages already quoted and briefly commented on.

What can we draw of these citations as significant aspects and conclusions with a view of mutual understanding?

1) First of all, we, both sides, need *a common language*. For, in all these passages one could easily perceive that for the Armenian theologians the word *nature* meant a concrete reality; and, as Samuel Vardapet said, it actually meant “the perfect man.” Therefore, to use the expression “Two Natures” in this concrete sense of the term, gives easily way to the conception of division in Christ. This fear of theirs has been justified because of the Tome of Leo where the natures are described as self-consistent entities with their proper operations. This way of thinking in Christology, indeed, was not far from what Nestorius had taught. Thus, the “Nestorianizing” tendency of the Council of Chalcedon was bitterly resented and fiercely opposed by those churches who eagerly maintained firm the teaching of the Council of Ephesus (431). And it must be admitted that before they showed the affinity between Chalcedonism and Nestorianism it was the Nestorians themselves who welcomed the Council of Chalcedon seeing in it the vindication of their position. There is ample evidence to this effect in the 5th and 6th century Armenian Church history, particularly in its relationship with the Syriac-speaking Christianity of Mesopotamia and Persia.

If the term *nature* were taken in an abstract sense, that is to say, as denoting the properties pertaining to Godhead and manhood in Christ, then it would have been more easily understood. In that case, however, one could legitimately but not necessarily speak of more than *two natures* as was hinted at in a passage quoted above. Nevertheless, it would have been a happier expression and more acceptable one than the “Two Natures” in the Leonine sense of the term.

2) The second point is that the basic reality of utmost sig-

¹⁵ *Book of Letters*, p. 315 .

nificance in the whole understanding of Christ's person is that it was God who became man. The whole meaning of the Incarnation is that God assumed the human nature in its entirety. The central, initiative action was God's. It was He who descended from above and united to Himself what belonged to man in order to save humanity from the death of sin. "*And the Word became flesh.*" This is the fundamental, essential and unique fact which has served the non-Chalcedonians of all times as the basis of their Christology and a watchword for their position. From the times of St. Athanasius and St. Cyril up to our present time the strong emphasis has always been put on this biblical affirmation.

Doctrinally, this affirmation has developed in the conception of the closest, most intimate, inseparable yet unconfused union of the divine and human natures in Christ, and to such a point that the flesh has become God's flesh through which He suffered, was crucified and dead and buried. The subject, so to speak, was always God the Word. The human nature did not stand in itself alone in Christ, but was assumed by God and made His own. It is in this respect that one can say that God suffered. "We confess, therefore," says Saint Nerses IV, the greatest Armenian Church Father and theologian with a strong sense of ecumenical spirit, "Christ as God and Man, but we do not mean division by this, God forbid!, because He Himself suffered and did not suffer; since by His divine nature He was immutable and impassible, but in His human body He suffered and died. Consequently, those who say that it was one who suffered and another who did not suffer, fall into error. Thus it was none other than the Word who suffered and embraced death in His body; because the same Word Himself who was impassible and incorporeal consented to become passible in order to save humanity by His Passion."¹⁶

Going on further, St. Nerses speaks about the relationship between the two natures in the following passage:

"We comply with those who confess two natures not divided according to Nestorius, and not confused according to the heterodox teachings of Eutyches and Apollinaris, but united unconfusedly and indivisibly. For example, man has body and soul; the two are of different natures, because one

¹⁶ *The Profession of Faith of the Armenian Church by St. Nerses Shnorhali*, pp. 37-38. Translated with introduction and comment by Terenig Vartabed Poladian (Boston, Mass., 1941).

is heavenly, the other earthly; one is visible, the other invisible; one is temporal, the other immortal; but after the union man is said to have one nature and not two. No confusion is thought of in saying that man has one nature. We do not think of man as only of soul or of flesh, but as the union of the two. Thus the nature of Christ is said to be one, not confused, but two natures ineffably united with each other. If it were not so, then we should have to consider not only two natures in Christ but three, two human natures, that is, soul and body, and one divine nature. But according to the writings of the Fathers, after the union the duality in the sense of separatedness disappeared.”¹⁷

3) If we are able to look further and deeper than what pure history gives us, in other words, if we can transcend certain historical formulations which have caused misunderstandings, without ignoring them or minimizing their significance, and grasp in a new effort of faithful obedience to Christ our faith in the Incarnation as such, I believe we have a firm common ground to stand on and make manifest our communion in faith. After all, faith is deeper and far more important than the formula which is a certain pattern of communication.¹⁸

The subsequent history of Chalcedon with all its efforts aiming at a conciliation between the Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian Churches has taught us that a rapprochement and a common understanding are possible if the problem is dealt with in itself, being distinguished from other problems of cultural, political or national character.

I should like to conclude this presentation with the challenging words of Catholicos Nerses IV:

“Therefore, if ‘One Nature’ is said for the indissoluble and indivisible union and not for the confusion, and ‘Two Natures’ is said as being unconfused, immutable and indivisible, *both are within the bounds of orthodoxy.*”¹⁹

If this statement could be made in the twelfth century, what conclusions can we draw from it in the twentieth century?

This is the real challenge we face in common.

¹⁷ Terenig, Vartabed Poladian, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-41.

¹⁸ On this specific point see the last part of my article in the *Ecumenical Review*, “The Ecumenical Problem in Eastern Christendom,” vol. xii, no. 4, July 1960, pp. 452-454.

¹⁹ See *Profession of Faith*, p. 41.

DISCUSSION: Concerning the Paper of Bishop Sarkessian

FATHER ROMANIDES: When you speak of one will and one energy, are you saying the same thing as Theodore and Nestorius?

BISHOP SARKISSIAN: When we speak of one, we always speak of a united one, not a simple numerical one.

ARCHBISHOP TIRAN: I would like to ask a question of the patristic theologians among us. Why was it that the Fathers of the 5th century did not, during their extensive disputations, make a serious attempt first to clarify and define their terms, so that there could be no confusion in their own minds and in the minds of their followers or opponents? Is it not strange that it is still not quite clear what the Fathers exactly meant by the few words which occupied their minds throughout the controversy, namely *physis*, *hypostasis*, *ousia*, etc.?

FATHER ROMANIDES: The clarification given by one side was not acceptable to the other. Each side believed that its terminology alone could protect the Church from heresy.

ARCHBISHOP TIRAN: Father Romanides' remark suggests that the debate was not really of substance but of semantics. I myself would not go as far as that, but would venture to say that the terms were not quite adequate to express in a satisfactory manner what the Fathers were struggling to express.

And there is another question which bothers me. It is this: Have the Fathers considered that if the humanity of Christ, the human nature of the Logos incarnate, is known by his human acts, his fleshly acts, such as eating, drinking, sleeping, etc., then on what basis can we say that he is still man, or human, or has human nature, after the Ascension? What light does the nature controversy throw on our belief that Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today and for eternity?

PROFESSOR FLOROVSKY: The Resurrection of the Body is a matter of faith, and is the basis of Christ's continuing humanity. The continuation of humanity with a body in the age to come is a mystery.

PROFESSOR MEYENDORFF: *Sarx* means created humanity and not necessarily physical flesh.

FATHER BOROVY: I am looking for the elements useful to our reconciliation. The first and the last pages of Bishop Sarkessian's paper are especially useful. The historical discussion is useful as information.

FATHER ROMANIDES: I got the impression that when the Armenian theologians argued against Chalcedon, they were arguing against Theodore of Mopsuestia — not against Chalcedon.

BISHOP SARKISSIAN: That is true to a large extent. As I already said, the Council of Chalcedon came to the consideration of the Armenians in the context of their fight against Nestorianism. The association between the Nestorian way of thinking and the early Chalcedonian understanding of Christology was a very close one. Those who followed Theodore of Mopsuestia in East Syria, Mesopotamia and Persia, were very happy with the Council of Chalcedon.

But this does not mean that the Armenian Church Fathers confounded Chalcedon and the dualistic Christology of Theodore. The second Council of Constantinople (553), with the condemnation of the *Three Chapters*, is most significant to this effect.

BISHOP EMILIANOS: There were attempts in the time of Photius to be reconciled with the Armenian Church, but the replies to Photius' letters seem to raise cultural rather than theological objections.

PROFESSOR MEYENDORFF: With due respect to Photius, his letters were too imperious and non-theological, and could hardly anticipate a theological reply.

PROFESSOR KONIDARIS: There is a fundamental inner coherence and continuity — therefore also unity — between all seven Ecumenical Councils. In consequence one cannot acknowledge only the first three. This has no particular bearing on the rapprochement and reunion between the Ancient Churches of the East and the Catholic Orthodox Church. We should remind ourselves that the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed did not prevent the necessity of its revision by the later Councils (3rd-6th), which simply interpreted the teachings of the first two on the basis of the faith of the Church in full conformity with the revealed truth.

August 14th, 1964, Morning Session.

THE LESSON OF HISTORY ON THE CONTROVERSY CONCERNING THE NATURE OF CHRIST

By ARCHBISHOP TIRAN NERSOYAN

The Lord Jesus Christ is perfect man and perfect God. He is the Logos incarnate, consubstantial with us as to his manhood and consubstantial with the Father as to his Godhood.

Both sides, Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian alike, agree to this confession of faith fully. They have always agreed to it since the Council of Nicaea. In the very grammatical structure of the sentence the subject denotes unity and the predicates denote duality. The word "perfect" closes the door to all quibble and prevarication. Both sides therefore accept, as a matter of course both unity and duality in Christ. One would think, off hand, that as an affirmation of faith and as a basis of unity this should be sufficient.

Yet the Fathers found that it was not enough. They felt, as the result of development of ideas on the subject, the need of erecting ramparts around the affirmation so that it could not be undermined by erroneous deductions and misrepresentations, and uncontrolled speculations could not do matricidal work by killing the central saving message of the affirmation, namely, the faith in the incarnation of the Son of God as man. Thus, in order to safeguard the core of the Christian message they used philosophical ideas to build up defenses around it.

Although I am not a specialist in matters of patristic theology, yet I would like to point out an important and significant precaution which the Fathers of both sides took when discussing the problems of Christology. They always said "we see," "we contemplate," "we recognize" two natures in Christ. The Lord is one, but He is seen, is made known in two or out of two. In other words, our determination about the nature or natures of Christ is conditioned by what we see in him when we look upon him acting during his earthly life. Some implied and some said outright that the Lord in His being and person had one nature but He was made known to us with characteristics, attributes pertaining to two different natures. They distinguished between what and who Christ

was in his own personal being and what He was seen and made known to be to the eyes of our human mind. The Fathers of both sides have been careful in making this distinction. But, alas, the point was lost on those who were quick to enter into the fray.

However, while the faith was firmly grounded in the Scriptures and in the Tradition in general, philosophical notions were not. It is well nigh impossible to make even bona fide philosophers agree. So, true to human nature, the disputants resorted to other means to secure agreements. For they knew that the unity of the Church was as important as the right affirmation of her faith. In fact they knew, as we know and should never forget, that the unity of the Church of Christ is inseparable from its orthodoxy.

We know also from history that those "other means" did not prove and could hardly be considered to be effective in securing the unity and orthodoxy of the Church. Emperors, courtiers, high placed ladies, turbulent monks, people ready to fish in troubled waters made the natural resolution of the problems impossible. They forced the hand of time and history. The history of the Eastern Church within itself, the history of the Eastern Church vis-à-vis the Western Church, the history of the Western Church within itself prove without a shadow of doubt the failure of those "other means" to secure the unity and the orthodoxy of the Church in its wholeness.

How do we get out of the difficulty? How can we resolve the impasse? Can we recover the unity of the Church by having recourse to the old methods? Can we come to agreements by philosophical determinations on matters that concern the faith?

Before referring to the perennial answer to this question, first formulated by Vincent of Lerin ("unity in essentials, freedom in things dubious and charity in all"), an answer which has not been taken at face value, and therefore has always been tabled because of the difficulty of drawing a line between the essentials and the doubtful, let me make another remark.

Churches and their theologians have fought their battles in the field of Christian philosophy or theology for a good purpose, no doubt. They have had legitimate motives and commendable zeal. That purpose was to defend the faith against the inroads of heretical speculations which if not checked would cause the decomposition and disintegration of the deposit of the faith. This kind of battle is part of the task of the Christian teacher.

But we know, as a matter of historical record, that often these battles fail to serve their purpose and are inconclusive. Not only because of the frailty of the human mind in the teacher and in the taught, but also because one or the other side in the dispute — and here I am referring to the Christological controversy — waned or waxed depending on the accidental factors and forces which were brought to bear upon the problem. The accession of one or other emperor on the Byzantine throne was paramount in deciding which side would have the upper hand. So eventually each side withdrew to its camp, built its own defenses and waited, and presumably has been waiting, in our case since the 7th century, for the so-called heresy to work out the destruction of the Church in the opposing camp.

Yet for fifteen centuries we have lived and worked, each side with its own so-called heresy or orthodoxy, as the case may be, and lo and behold, we still maintain that Christ is perfect man and perfect God, and the central affirmations of our common faith, nay, even the peripheral affirmations thereof are not found to be contradictory. The faith of either side has not really been impaired to any degree by our so-called heresies and none of the dire results that were anticipated has come about. In fact when we come to think of it, we are even embarrassed to find ourselves in seemingly opposing camps. Not only are we good Christians, albeit sinful, but we are good orthodox Christians, speaking non-technically, as it were. The supposedly poisonous heresies have produced no deleterious effects on the general health of our Christian faith and the overall orthodoxy of our churches. The conclusion cannot be escaped that neither the teaching of one nature nor the teaching of two natures has made a difference in the real orthodoxy of the Church or in the operation of the Holy Spirit therein. Can we say, perhaps, that the very exercise of our intellectual muscles has kept us on both sides fairly trim and healthy?

What better proof can we have for the contention that our bitter theological quarrels were not really so terribly necessary after all, even though normal and calm discussions could not be dispensed with. And if some people had not been so terribly intent to use the Church for their own non-theological purposes, the quarrels would not have been so tumultuous and sometimes so disastrous, when they did take place.

Let me nevertheless say this, that if I had lived in the fifth or in the sixth century I would have said that the fight could

not be avoided. I would have considered the issues so vital that I would have engaged myself in the thick of the battle for the sake of my Lord.

Before I came here I read for a second time the full treatise of Timothy Aeluros against the Chalcedonians. This treatise was used as teacher's guide to orthodox theology among non-Chalcedonians. I am referring to "the Polemics" of Timothy, the Pope of Alexandria, written during the sixties of the 5th century when he was in exile in Cherson, and translated into Armenian some twenty years later and published in 1912 from an ancient manuscript of the 10th century, that contains the whole of the text, some 320 pages. I could not help being moved by the man's plea, made with sincerity, conviction and competence, in the style of the Fathers of the Church of his time. And I venture to say that Chalcedonians will have a difficult time to find fault with the arguments. Timothy quotes Dioscorus, his predecessor, who says: "I know full well, having been brought up in the faith, that the Lord has been begotten of the Father as God and that the same has been begotten of Mary as man. See him walking on the earth as man and creator of the heavenly hosts as God; see him sleeping in the boat as a man and walking on the seas as God; see him hungry as man and giving food as God; see him thirsty as man and giving drink as God; see him stoned by Jews as man and worshipped by angels as God; see him tempted as man and driving demons away as God, and similarly of many other instances." He says again: "God the Logos consubstantial with the Father at the end of the ages became consubstantial with man in the flesh for our redemption, remaining what he was before." I quoted this passage out of many similar ones, found in the writings of Timothy, only to show how much he is in agreement with the positive aspects of the teaching of the Council of Chalcedon. He almost sounds like Leo, except where the latter personalizes the two natures of Christ and merely conjoins the divine Logos and the man Jesus, saying further that one of the two natures is he who died and the other is he who did not die. Yet notwithstanding some of the unfortunate expressions found in the Tome, the non-Chalcedonians can perhaps explain the Tome of Leo in the light of the positive statements of the Council on which there was and there is, I hope, substantial agreement all round. Perhaps we can take the Tome as a theological document sent to the Churches by the Council of Chalce-

don for study, even if this is the modern manner of speaking of the World Council of Churches. For we have to recognize that the bitter quarrel arose really not because of the substance of the Chalcedonian definition but because of the Tome which the Council was constrained to adopting in toto on the insistence of the imperial commissioners. After all, the non-Chalcedonians would not overlook the fact that the Fathers in Chalcedon reversed themselves completely so soon after the Council of 449. We must not fail to pay its due to human frailty, even though we believe that the Holy Spirit speaks through the Church and Divine Providence ultimately guides its course through history.

We have now fourteen centuries behind us. We can now see that the fears of the men of the fifth century did not prove to be well founded after all. In the course of these fourteen centuries, after the endless and bitter incriminations, struggles, tragedies, catastrophes, we have arrived nowhere in our efforts to secure the unity of the Church. The fact that after ages of discussion and debate, seasoned with insults and invectives, we still are there where we were at the beginning of the engagement, proves that the mystery must remain what it is — a mystery stated in its naked form. Is it not time for this generation to realize that the methods used by our forefathers were not the right ones for the attainment of their goal?

The methods employed in these remote centuries were not always chosen deliberately, sincerely, singlemindedly with the ultimate goal in view. The charity of the protagonists in the disputes was overshadowed by their zeal for the defense of the theological form of their orthodoxy.

To be sure, events happen in history with valid reasons grounded in the realities of a given situation. And powers, sometimes divine and sometimes, alas, demonic propel men and things forward. Yet we cannot eliminate accidents which divert history from its course. Who knows, perhaps we are committed to our several theological positions because of legacies we inherit from history that is full of accidents or the result of a series of accidents that have happened during the turbulent life of the Church? Should we not be mindful of this possibility and re-evaluate our positions accordingly, giving free rein, unobstructed rein to the Holy Spirit in our minds and souls?

Perhaps the defense mechanisms of peoples on each side of the battle lines in the fifth and sixth centuries operated in order

to ensure their security in realms other than purely theological or even credal. All kinds of fears, real or imaginary, wind the springs of the life of peoples. Social, economic, cultural, political factors pinned each side to its own battle grounds. No Syrian or Armenian was going to become Greek by accepting the emperor's dubious orthodoxy and thereby being incorporated in his Church. No Egyptian was going to be subservient to an emperor across the seas who was always despoiling him of his crops. No Syrian or Armenian was willing to be subjected to severities by the great Shah of Iran for being on good terms and in the same church with the new Romans of the West. Conversely no Greek was to be indifferent to the alienation of the Western lands in Europe from the Empire or to the influx in force of foreigners throughout the length and breadth of its ancient patrimony, which would happen, he must have felt, if he allowed the orthodoxy of non-Chalcedonians.

Our fierce but great and adorable Fathers of the Church acted well in the roles which Providence assigned to them. They were beset and gripped by anxieties in the face of the paradoxical demands of their faith upon their vaunted rationalism. They fought with desperation to escape into pretensions of comprehension of the central mystery of the Christian faith, namely the union of God and man in one unique person.

But we must come back to our times and to our question. Can we, should we necessarily agree on determinations that are primarily within the realm of Christian philosophy, that is to say theology, which is the philosophical systematization of the explanations of the deposit of the Faith?

Past experience should make us doubt that we can. Except if we agree to disagree on matters that concern the foliage of the tree of the faith, so that the tree can blow and flourish in a free atmosphere, so that its tender shoots can bend wherever the Spirit hits them.

Let us thank God that we agree on the fundamentals. Let us also thank God that the wound which was opened on the Body of Christ has not deepened beyond healing in the course of long centuries. On the contrary it is showing signs of healing. Let us co-operate with the Lord in quickening the process of healing. And we can do that if we leave the theologians free to discuss philosophical problems related to the faith and explaining the faith. Let us leave them free to enlighten our way while we

march in the united Church along the royal road. As a matter of fact, when we come to think of it, we now do leave theologians free to express their opinions, and they are not too much afraid of being anathematized and exiled. For if we had followed the style of former centuries we would have to convene General Church Councils every so often to examine and pass on the writings and preachings of as many theologians as are daring enough to publish theological treatises with an open and inquiring mind; and with the laudable purpose of explaining the faith in terms of the patterns of thought of their own present generation. Let us leave confession and explanation separate, so far as it is possible and practicable.

And let us be mindful of the fact that our disagreements do not cover much ground on the vast field of Christian doctrine. Is it not significant that the one problem which is engaging us today is this question, undoubtedly important, of the nature controversy. Many other questions, large and small, on which at one time or another there was disagreement in the Church have disappeared or have been outdated. Our past disagreement on the meaning and application of the term "nature" should melt away and lose its significance in the extensive area of our mutual agreements on all other matters of faith. The intellectual atmosphere of our age cannot bear disputes in the style of the fourth, fifth or the sixth centuries, even though we stand in an immeasurable debt specially to the great church fathers of those centuries. And it seems to me that if we leave their style behind us, the quarrels also will be left behind. For we do not in fact feel, think and speak or work in the style of the patristic age. And as soon as we translate the style of their language of theology into our own language of the present age, we shall see that the dispute on the two natures will lose its form and therefore its old urgency.

Can we make that translation? This is the great question — the question of the relevance of ancient patterns of thought into our present world-outlook and manner of thinking.

The problem which the Fathers debated was, essentially, the problem of the relationship between the spiritual and the temporal, between heaven and earth, between God and man. This problem, to be sure, is an eternal problem. We discuss this problem now everyday, but we do not thereby rock the boat of the Church as they did of old. I dare say we will not even disagree too much on the question among ourselves.

Furthermore, any harmful element which a theologian of our present age might suspect there lurks in one or other formula, Chalcedonian or non-Chalcedonian, will be of no effect in a united communion. Even if, I say if, there is a trace of poison in one or other formula, it will produce no bad effects on our spiritual health in a united communion. The Church will march on, notwithstanding any predelection which one or other theologian might have for this or that form of asserting the unity of Christ in his divinity and manhood.

After all, we recognize the tree by its fruits. And when I quote the Lord's words I have no intention of appearing facile or philistine. That divine dictum has an extremely important bearing on the problem we have come to discuss. The tree of the Church grown on Chalcedonian soil and the tree of the Church grown on non-Chalcedonian soil have both given good fruits, so far as those fruits go. As I have already mentioned, fourteen full centuries have proved that. And proof given by history is the proof of life itself, not the hollow proof of syllogisms or philosophical speculations. Why should we continue to be suspicious of the quality of the seed or of the tree when the fruits are there?

Let us, therefore, leave the problem of Christology on the specific point of the nature or natures of the Lord for free discussion and communication *within* a united communion. Our sense of mission and apostolate towards our peoples and towards the world should not allow us to insist on conformism on the basis of one or other formula, where conformism is not really necessary.

In a united communion each of our churches will live and work as before, trying as best as it can to bring the message of the Gospel to its own people. We shall only stop calling each other names and will consider each other as being orthodox after exchanging irenical declarations of confession. It is a deeply rooted policy of all Eastern Churches that each people, that has its own culture, language, rite, particular canons, national character developed in the course of its history, shall govern itself independently of others, except when they are faced with common problems that require common solutions, as in the days of the undivided Church.

I believe it to be true to facts when I say that our division has reduced itself to being merely formal and not real from a dogmatic point of view. I believe I am justified in standing among you and saying that no Eastern churchman can in good faith con-

sider another Eastern churchman, bona fide subscribing to the teachings of his church, be he Chalcedonian or non-Chalcedonian, to be an heretic in reality. I want to say again that heresy is bad because it endangers the faith, it causes progressive deviation from the right path to salvation and to the kingdom of God. But now, after the famous Council, we, Greeks, Egyptians, Syrians, Armenians, Russians, Indians, Ethiopians and others, are at least as near each other in real orthodoxy as we were prior to the Council. And when I say the Council I include in it the remaining three of the seven, for they were only part of the fourth.

It is always good for the church to regurgitate theological problems of days gone by. It is profoundly important that we must never let the Fathers get out of our system. On the other hand, while we are, as orthodox, committed to the sense of the Scriptures, to the Word of God, to the deposit of the faith in the church, to the teachings of the Fathers, to the apostolic tradition, yet we are not committed to the philosophical tools which the Fathers used to explain the faith. Can we disentangle the two, confession and explanation? We can and as a matter of fact we do. We do not accept, for example, the cosmogonies and cosmologies of the Fathers, or of the Scriptures for that matter. Even Jesuits recognize that the creation stories of the Genesis are mythological in form. Most of us believe in evolution. Have we abandoned the Fathers in doing this? I think not. In order to be a good Christian do we have to choose between Platonists and Aristotelians? I think not. Hypothetically speaking, if I can use even logical positivism as a tool for the defense of my orthodox faith, I will not hesitate to do so, without of course committing myself to its atheism. There are Christian existentialists and atheist existentialists. The fact that we are trying to find out what the Fathers meant by the word "nature" shows that we agree on the sense of the Fathers. So let us all agree on the sense and leave physiology and the enumeration of natures alone, or rather let us use both indifferently as the Fathers and St. Cyril did in fact before the Council. Let us take the word nature meaning the qualities or the mode of being of the person as a whole and then say one, or take it as meaning the divine qualities or the mode of being of the person of Christ and His human qualities or the mode of being separately, and say two. As a matter of fact, both sides will be safer if we both use both forms. This sounds all too Zenonian. But it is not, because we are in the

twentieth century and as I tried to explain above, much water has passed under the bridge in the meantime.

Let us learn and be learned by all means, but let us at the same time march with the times and with our feet firmly gripping the realities of our situation.

DISCUSSION: Concerning the Paper of Archbishop Tiran

BISHOP EMILIANOS: Theology is more than philosophical speculation. It belongs to the essence of the Church. We cannot disparage it so lightly.

FATHER BOROVOV: I am happy with the spirit of the paper. The details and specific expressions we can discuss. But if we take the direction recommended by the paper, we must also keep in mind the distinction between *theologoumena* and *philosophoumena*. Different schools can use different philosophical terminology, but we must be one in our dogma.

PROFESSOR MEYENDORFF: The content of faith cannot be compromised. We cannot afford to become indifferent to dogma.

ARCHBISHOP TIRAN: I agree of course with Fr. Meyendorff. All I want to say is that the explanation of established dogma has to be brought up to date.

FATHER ROMANIDES: It is very important to distinguish the basic intuition and vision of faith from the role of philosophy in theology. Serious mistakes can be made in this regard. In our common Alexandrian-Cappadocian tradition the nature of the use of theological and philosophical terms is to be understood as an expression of the faith in the modern idiom of any age, having first adjusted the meaning of terms to serve the Church's kerygma. The Church can never accept any philosophical idiom as a means of *understanding* and *comprehending* the faith as happened with the Augustinian and Antiochene traditions and as still happens today within Roman Catholic and Protestant theological circles. The Church uses philosophy in order to make herself understood, but never in order to understand herself.

It is important to note the fact that doctrinally Chalcedon was not a reversal of the Ephesine Council of 449 since Eutyches was exonerated on the basis of his acceptance, sincerely or hypocritically, of the double consubstantiality of Christ. This Council was rejected by Chalcedon because of its handling of the cases of Flavian, Eusebius, and Eutyches and because it completely ignored Leo, having realized from the content of his Tome that the bishop of Rome did not understand the nature of the Christological problems debated in the East. The bishops at Chalcedon were generally the very same ones who took part in the Ephesine Council of 449. It is unrealistic to believe that they felt that they were doctrinally reversing themselves at Chalcedon. The manner in which they handled Leo's Tome is proof of their doctrinal stability.

It seems that one of our basic problems is to get a better and historically accurate understanding of what happened to the reconciliation of 433. The question which faces us is why this terminological agreement collapsed. Perhaps we should study the effects the alliance between Leo and Theodoret had on the Alexandrians between the Ephesine Council of 449 and Chalcedon.

PROFESSOR NISSIOTIS: We must distinguish between the intention of this paper and what it actually proposes. The nature of the Incarnation is a mystery, but not necessarily irrational. It is a mystery which can be communicated, though imperfectly. And the terminology has significance for the revealed truth itself. The discarding of old terminology does not solve the problem but creates new problems. There is a deposit not only of faith, but also of the means of expression, even in the Scriptures. *Physis, hypostasis, prosopon* are all New Testament terms.

PROFESSOR FLOROVSKY: I was also moved by the spirit of Archbishop Tirán's paper. I am also for peace and reconciliation. But I must disagree with the sharp distinction between faith or confession and philosophy. Faith or confession requires philosophy. We must be fair to our Fathers. These Fathers had conviction and we must come to terms with the convictions and not merely with the terms.

The style of the *Patristic* age cannot be abandoned. That is the only solution for contemporary theology. There is no one modern idiom which can unite the Church.

PROFESSOR KONIDARIS: Our discussion has been most fruitful here. But we have a responsibility to be faithful to the Fathers and the Councils. The very essence of our faith requires this faithfulness to all the seven Councils.

FATHER SAMUEL: The details of the Archbishop's paper should not be pressed. His main intention should however be taken seriously.

ARCHBISHOP TIRÁN: Terms are in constant flux, and there is a limit beyond which their meaning cannot be fixed. The Nicene discussion was not simply terminological. The question was whether Christ was God or not. It was a clear choice. In Chalcedon there was no such clear issue. It was, as all of us here agree, mainly a terminological dispute, with agreement in essentials. We must not put the two debates at the same level.

On the method of achieving intercommunion, I would like to say quite frankly that for our Churches it would be difficult to accept Chalcedon beforehand without qualification and explanations. It would be difficult to accept Chalcedon in a manner in which its acceptance would appear as a brusque reversal of position and admission of long-standing error. But if intercommunion is first restored, then the atmosphere will be cleared and a situation will be created among our churches where it will be easy and natural to agree with what a sister church has agreed to in order to safeguard the faith in accordance with the teachings of the Fathers.

August 14th, 1964, Morning Session.

THE QUESTION OF RECONCILIATION AND REUNION BETWEEN THE ANCIENT ORIENTAL AND THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES

By THE REV. PROFESSOR VITALY BOROVY

The question pertaining to the ways and means of an eventual reunion of Christians in the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and in particular the reunion of the Oriental national churches which reject the Council of Chalcedon with the Orthodox Church which accepts the Council is not new. It appeared at the very initial stages of the schism.

Negotiations lasted, with interruption, for entire centuries; many varying and variously combined means and approaches were tried. The theological and historical materials related to this question are so numerous that it is easy to be misled by their very profusion.

It can be noted, however, that since the beginning and until our time, two types of approaches to the question prevailed in practice, which are known in the East as *henosis kat' oikonomian* and *henosis dogmatike*.

The first emphasized love as a way to union, the second rested on the search for Truth.

Love for each other was indeed the starting point of the first approach; it was leading the protagonists to close their eyes on the differences which separated them, to cover them with mutual tolerance and thus attain concord in mutual relations. The existing *status quo* both in faith and in discipline was accepted as the basis for such a unity, with hardly any concession being made by either side.

The first way towards union is also called in the West *unio conservativa*; the second *unio temperativa*. Both were covered by a *formula concordiae*.

The fundamental basis of the second type of union — the *henosis dogmatike* — was love for the Truth. Both sides jointly tried to establish on which side lay the Truth, the *akribeia ton dogmaton*. As a result of these joint efforts, one of the two sides renounced its errors, accepted the *akribeia ton dogmaton* and

agreed with the other in doctrine, and sometimes also in practice and discipline. Such a union was normally based upon a jointly accepted Creed or Confession.

Very frequently, however, the real impulsion which provoked unions of the first type — that is unions *kat' oikonomian* — was not in mutual love, but out of practical consideration, and very often, bitter necessity; disadvantages of schism, dangers which hung over the heads of one or both sides, mutual interests, etc. In fact, unions of this type were rather conditional agreements which led those who took part in them to maintain peace and good relations with each other, following certain conditions, while their actual life remained separate and there was no united Church. Since the agreements between the two sides were not aimed at solving their doctrinal and disciplinary differences, but at simply masking them, the latter soon reappeared and shattered artificially concluded unions, so that unions *kat' oikonomian* were always short-lived.

The *henoseis dogmatikai* possessed a quite different character. They led to real unions, so that the churches really became one Church, with not only a common faith, but also with common life. Such unions were solid and lasting.

Our conclusion is clear; the true Christian union is an *henosis dogmatike*. However, it is unfortunately difficult to achieve and it takes time. Many Christians were, and still are, attracted by the perspective of an *henosis kat' oikonomian*.

The error in all the union schemes of the past was that *one* of the mentioned theories — either the *henosis kat' oikonomian* or *henosis dogmatike* — was chosen as excluding the other. And since the one was always short-lived and the other was difficult to achieve the results of all past efforts were negligible.

What form of union shall we adopt in our unofficial conversations?

Clearly, a final goal should be the *henosis dogmatike*, a union in faith and in Truth. But the way towards such union must go through union in love, *henosis kat' oikonomian*. At the present stage of our rapprochement, we have not reached a joint agreement in faith; we must, therefore, concentrate all our efforts on the preparation and the realization of an *henosis kat' oikonomian*.

Every participant of our Consultation will present a report and all the materials to his ecclesiastical authorities.

The competent authorities of our churches are entitled, if they approve these reports, to consult the other sister-churches.

The Orthodox can discuss the issue at the forthcoming Pan-Orthodox Consultation on Rhodes, in November of this year.

Our brethren, who do not accept the Council of Chalcedon, can discuss the problem at their consultation in Addis Ababa in September.

If the results of these two consultations are positive, a joint theological commission could be formed. The commission will elaborate the right methods of further rapprochement. In particular, it could discuss and present for the approval of our churches:

- a. A list of theological, historical, historiographical and practical themes which need joint elaboration.
- b. Recommendations towards the formation of sub-commissions which would be entrusted with the task of working on individual problems and methodology.
- c. Projects for an exchange of church delegations, professors of theology and students.
- d. Projects tending towards necessary reforms in our theological curricula, especially in the fields of Church History, History of dogma, and Patristics, which would promote better and more objective understanding of issues, avoiding all polemical spirit.
- e. Projects dealing with mutual information about the life of our respective churches, exchange of articles, theological periodicals and literature.

When these preparatory steps will meet with the approval of our churches and will bring their first positive results, we shall be able to approach the next step in the preparation of our *henosis kat' oikonomian*. The joint commission will then have to elaborate the project of a Standing Conference of Eastern Orthodox Churches and present it for the approval of our respective ecclesiastical authorities.

The Standing Conference of Eastern Orthodox Churches will elaborate a common policy in our relations with the other Christian churches, families of churches, confessional alliances and international ecclesiastical organizations; e.g. a common policy towards the Roman Catholic Church, the Old Catholic Church, the

Anglican Communion, Protestantism, the World Council of Churches, etc.

The joint policy in our relations with the other Christian confessions and organizations, the common efforts in the defense and realization of this policy will bring our churches closer together so that we shall be able to initiate the process of passing from our *henosis kat' oikonomian* to an *henosis dogmatike*, a union in faith.

The Standing Conference will then appoint a joint commission of dogmatists, who will draft a common formula on the problem of Christology and the Council of Chalcedon.

After the approval of such a formula of agreement by the churches, a real *henosis dogmatike* will be realized, together with our *communio in sacris* and a common participation in the life of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, without prejudice to the jurisdictional independence and autocephaly of all our churches, which would keep their national historical characteristics.

August 14th, 1964, Morning Session.

A THEOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE MIA-PHYSIS CHRISTOLOGY IN THE FIFTH CENTURY

By DR. K. N. KHELLA

Cyril was the last church father whose teaching was accepted by the whole Christian Church. The controversy which began after his death had to do with the way in which his doctrine was to be interpreted. The opponents of Cyril's theology also participated in the controversy. They, however, did not openly express their criticism in order not to lay themselves open to the suspicion that they were disturbing the peace of the Church. That led to the unusual situation that differing Christologies and contradictory doctrines all tried to take their bearings from Cyril. Dioscoros, Cyril's successor, made it his prime task to preserve Cyril's heritage and to defend it against all attacks. So one may consider his pontificate as the continuation of Cyril's influence. There was only one possibility if the peace of the Church was to be maintained: to help to victory the tradition which Cyril has also defended "without adding anything to it or subtracting anything from it." This stance soon brought him into conflict with his colleagues in Antioch, Constantinople and Rome, although the apostolic bishops also characterized themselves as representatives of Cyril's Christology or at least claimed that their teaching was not contradictory to his. When Dioscoros, in the year 449, received the Emperor's commission to hold an imperial synod in Ephesus under his chairmanship, he used this opportunity to renew the victory of the tradition over all "heretical" (i.e. revisionist) attacks. In this way Cyril, in the person of Dioscoros, triumphed again. In connection with Ephesus II, Dioscoros received from the Emperor the formal right to depose all opponents of the doctrine of the great councils (325 and 431). He exercised this right even against the Roman Bishop. Then, however, took place the change in the historical situation following the death of the Emperor Theodosius II in the year 450. With the change of sovereign, Byzantium began a new religious policy. The first political act of the new ruling pair was the convocation of a new council, in the hope of furthering the unity of the Christian Roman Empire on a new basis and of ensuring the permanence

of Byzantine domination. But the synod, which was to have demonstrated the unity in both Church and Empire, led to division in both. Dioscoros was deposed on 13th October 451 in Chalcedon and banished to Gangra, where he spent the rest of his life.

THE TWO THEOLOGICAL TRENDS OF THE TIME: THE TRADITIONALISTS AND THE REVISIONISTS

At the centre of all that has been handed down to us of the theology of the fifth century stands the problem of the time, the problem of Christology. In this situation Dioscoros (and other information apart from his own confirms this) is seen to be marked by his adherence to the tradition of the fathers "without adding anything to it or subtracting anything from it." He is represented as the one who championed the unadulterated doctrine of the great councils and defended the "one nature of the incarnate Logos" in which the humanity and the divinity of Christ were united without separation or confusion. Since the tendency is to prove the agreement of Dioscoros with the tradition, his views are constantly supported by the words of Scripture, the councils and the fathers. On the other hand, our sources provide us also with a more exact statement of the systematic development of this theology and of his exegesis. From what has been said, it is clear that at this point also he adhered to the tradition of his predecessors in the See of Alexandria.

The definition of the Church's doctrine by the Councils of Nicea and Ephesus decisively determined the relation of the Church to its theological tradition. It was possible to indicate exactly the "orthodoxy" of a doctrine or a group. Whoever acknowledged both councils, and with them the faith of the fathers, was orthodox. Orthodoxy consisted, therefore, in adhering to the ecumenical decisions "without adding anything to it or subtracting anything from it." While, however, all claimed to adhere to the faith of the fathers, there were individual groups which — contrary to their claim — sought to introduce innovations, at least in the field of interpretation. These innovations consisted, according to the orthodox, in the abrogation of important statements of faith. The "conservatives" saw clearly that the "innovators," although they claimed to adhere to the faith and credal formulae of the fathers, obliterated the distinctions made in face of heresy. Therefore any reference to the "two natures" was inevitably

odious to the orthodox (= traditionalists), because it was apt to veil the opposition between the orthodox doctrine and Nestorianism.

This struggle of the parties in the middle of the fifth century therefore has not only to do with the understanding of the union of the two natures of the person of Christ. The conflict is rather to be seen in its wider context, namely in the relation of the Church to its tradition. The Church is instituted by God to be the guardian of the revealed faith and commissioned to interpret it; therefore there must necessarily always be traditionalists and modernists in the Church. With these presuppositions, Dioscoros could only see himself as the guardian of the Church's tradition. Likewise, Leo was bound to appear to him as the leader of the innovators. For the traditionalists of course, a renewal of doctrine or definition meant also a deviation; such a renewal brought the danger of heresy onto the scene, even if no one wanted to make this accusation explicitly. Therefore the controversy about the doctrine of the two natures is basically a controversy about the problem, whether one may undertake a new formulation of dogma. For Dioscoros and his followers this was not permissible. They wished to hold to the Nicenum and the Ephesenum. That they had to refer to "two" councils, was a blemish in their argument. "Two councils in name," Dioscoros used to say, "but one in faith." Naturally, his opponents also claimed to represent the faith of the fathers. While he tried to decide the new dispute about the natures of Christ on the basis of the statements of the existing confessions and refused to admit a new definition, the revisionists had to prove that the old confessions were insufficient and that their own statements also were grounded in the statements of the fathers.

One must be clear about the fact that this did not have to do with individuals, but with ecclesiastical parties. More precisely, there was a very wide range of views in each party, and there were extremists on both sides. There were, to boot, heretical groups which stood outside both parties, but which tried to attach themselves, with their views, to one party or the other. Accordingly they used the current terminology, made use of the arguments which were employed by the two parties in the conflict, and sided with the theses of the party which stood nearer to them at the time. This can be shown, for example, in the dispute between Eutyches and Flavian at the *Synodos Endemousa* of 448.

Eutyches declared that he had never before heard or learned such a thing, but was prepared to submit to the judgment of the bishops present. Flavian, who could not ignore the offensiveness, reacted very sensitively: "It is not we who are introducing innovations, but this is the way our fathers put the matter." The point is to be seen also in the manner in which the monks reacted to the condemnation of Dioscoros at the meeting of 13th October in Chalcedon. By condemning Dioscoros, the embodiment of the Church's tradition, the synod was thought to have annulled the Nicenum and the Ephesenum. By deposing the Bishop of Alexandria, the members of the synod had set themselves in contradiction to the doctrines of the great councils.

The ensuing dispute between Carosos and the synod shows still more clearly the claim of both parties to adhere to the Church's tradition. The Archimandrite declared: "I persist in the faith of the 318 fathers of Nicea in which I was baptized, and in the definition of the fathers who deposed Nestorius at Ephesus; that is my belief, and of another faith I know nothing." The opposition party could not object to this argument, for the faith of the fathers was the incontrovertible basis of orthodox thinking and teaching. By confessing the faith of the fathers, Carosos forced his opponents to defend themselves. He was therefore immediately given the answer, that no one at the Synod of Chalcedon was thinking of tampering with Nicea or Ephesus. But the new points of dispute which had been raised had forced Leo, as once Cyril, to interpret the Symbol of Nicea; but no one had allowed himself an expansion of the faith and of the dogma.

This adherence to the Church's tradition is the decisive characteristic of the views of Dioscoros. As the Bishop of Alexandria, having his views stamped with the spirit of the Alexandrian school, the doctrine of the fathers formed the very heart of his faith. For Dioscoros, orthodoxy meant the unaltered continuing existence of the Church's tradition. It was to preserve this existence that he had been installed in his office. He appealed to the fact, "that the bishops of Alexandria had never abandoned the right faith." And at another place he says: "Look, here is the orthodox faith of Nicea . . . here are the Twelve Chapters of St. Cyril and of the others, which Dioscoros brought in this land . . . see, I go to my God with this faith in my hands and bring it back to him as a gift."

In saying all this, we have named the reason why Dioscoros

could not have been the inventor of a Christology of his own; if he had wanted this, he would have had to contradict his own theological conviction. Rather the theological principle of the perfection of the Symbol can be traced back to him. He proclaimed that the Church's doctrine is complete. Even if up to this point God has been revealing himself, dogma is now lacking in nothing which is necessary for our understanding. Our task now is only to preserve what we received by tradition, without adding anything to it or subtracting anything from it. That has never been said before with such decisiveness. Dioscoros is the teacher of a new epoch, one whose historical consciousness is determined by the cessation of the revelation of dogma. That is a peculiarly modern Christian turn in the idea of completeness. No other father expressed, as he did, the view that the Church's doctrine was given by God, through the Holy Spirit, via the apostles, councils and fathers as far as Cyril; the Church's tradition has become a fixed and completely closed entity.

As we said above, Dioscoros could not have been, nor wished to be, the inventor of a theology. The progress marked by his views consists in the fact that he proclaimed the cessation of the formulation of dogmas. This is shown precisely in his Christology; even this is no new creation, but tradition. It is wholly a repetition of the witness of the fathers, primarily (of course) the witness of his teacher and father St. Cyril of Alexandria. This indeed does not mean that he takes no credit for the further theological development; in particular, he gave to the terminology of Cyril a sharper and clearer formulation. All the same, he remains wholly within the bounds given to him; the views of the fathers are normative with respect to what they say and what they do not say. When Dioscoros takes up a position with regard to the heresies and doctrines of his time, he proves his own opinion, wherever possible, by quotations or by showing that certain points are not in accord with the teaching of the fathers; for the teaching of the fathers is truth. In this point there is an unmistakable difference between Dioscoros on the one hand and Flavian and Leo on the other. These last also were keen to support their opinions with the views of the fathers. But their unrestricted interpretation and further development of the doctrine of the fathers was not possible for Dioscoros. His position with respect to the Chalcedon formula is the necessary result of this; for the formula of Chalcedon is more than (say) a further development

of Cyrillic Christology. For Dioscoros, by contrast, Christology does not mean speculation, but doctrine, i.e. a fact which one receives by tradition from one's teacher and passes on to one's own pupils. In the church the generations change, but not the dogma; it is the same teaching which is taken up and passed on further. One can find this principle of faithfulness in preserving and transmitting tradition down the generations in a song of the Coptic Church, probably composed by Dioscoros himself. The song is sung by the congregation after the intercession for the dead, and it emphasizes faithfulness to the doctrine in which the fathers died, in which the present generation stands, and in which all future members and generations of the church will stand:

Hosper en kai estai estin apo geneas eis genean kai pantas tous aionas ton aionon, amen.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF DIOSCOROS

It is clear that Dioscoros followed the Christology of Cyril as he found it when he entered upon his pontificate. Christ is, as universally believed, perfect God and perfect man, consubstantial with the Father and with us; in Him divinity and humanity are never mixed, confused or changed; He is one and the same person, both in His eternal pre-existence and also in the economy in which He fulfills the intentions of God and those of man.

From the beginning, Dioscoros had a different starting-point for his thinking than that of his Chalcedonian opponents. Their doctrine was bound to offend his thought and speech from the start; first, because it had to do with innovations and then, because it contradicted his soteriological conviction. He did not see what was the good of a new formulation. The terminology used by himself fulfilled the same intentions as the Chalcedonian formula was intended to serve. It was not as if the Alexandrian language did not recognize the permanent duality of the elements in the union, even if it spoke only of "one" physis. Alexandrian Christology made a thorough-going distinction between the divinity and the humanity after the incarnation and had, moreover, found apt formulations in which it could speak of this. But the negative attitude of Dioscoros was directed above all against "innovation." The synod of Chalcedon determined a change in that formula of Cyril which had been acknowledged by Ephesus; that meant for Dioscoros the removal of the old expression and the introduction of a new.

Dioscoros' view was not framed according to this own free judgment. He was forced into it, because the foundation of his basic presupposition, which becomes clear in his Christology, was that the revelation of the doctrine about Christ is to be found in tradition. Therefore he could not break loose from tradition, and he wanted above all to remain Cyrillic (until his death, Cyril was taken for the representative of orthodoxy, and he won a world-wide recognition for this). One may, therefore, never forget that the authoritative argument of tradition played the most important role with Dioscoros. He was constantly looking out for the written Biblical and patristic sources, and of these he used above all the works of St. Cyril. For him, the authority of this father was decisive at all points, and the facts show that it was not boastfulness when he taught that he followed Cyril's doctrine not by half measure but to the full. The same was true also of his successors, who are all distinguished by their rich knowledge of the fathers.

So we must say that the Christology of Dioscoros was pre-Chalcedonian and remained so. Dioscoros refused the Chalcedonian innovations in the Christological formulas; he would not accept the expression "two" natures, first on the theological ground that there should be no innovations, and then on Christological grounds. Therefore, the reason for his refusal to acknowledge the Chalcedonian Symbol was not that he rejected the doctrine which spoke of the presence and permanence of the true divinity and the true humanity, undivided and unconfused, in Christ; for this he had himself, as a conservative, already learned and taught. Rather did the views of Dioscoros, in contrast to those of Leo, represent the natural continuation of the traditional conciliar theology.

* * *

There resulted from this, for the first time in Church history, a lasting schism, reaching into the present, between major groups within the Christian church. Even the adherents of the synod were not united in their view, so that the seed of the second schism between East and West in 1054 was already sown at Chalcedon. In the ensuing history, the fateful consequences of this ecumenical error are seen, not only in that this was a preparation for the fall of the Byzantine Empire and therefore for the triumph of Islam, but rather in that it also split the unity of the Church in a schism which lasts to this present day. Already at the time, peo-

ple in the church and at court, in clerical and in lay circles, had a presentiment of the grave consequences which the condemnation of Dioscoros would bring in its train. Monastic representatives declared before the synod on 17th October 451 that, if Dioscoros were not rehabilitated, the division in Christendom would no longer be able to be removed. Even the conciliar judges saw in the condemnation of Dioscoros not only a great injustice, but also a step heavy with consequences, a step for which the synod would have to account before God. At the synod itself, a considerable opposition set itself, in spite of all the threats, against the Roman legates who had in fact effected the deposition of Dioscoros. There was really no victor in the Chalcedonian dispute. The Church lost power to expand; the power and the very existence of the Empire were shaken. The power and solidarity, which the unity of the Church and the unity of the Empire brought with them, were irretrievably lost.

DISCUSSION: Concerning the Papers of Father Borovoy and Dr. Khella

FATHER ROMANIDES: We should not give the impression that insistence on purity of doctrine is wrong because ensuing schisms helped make barbarian conquests successful. Revelation must never become subject to political expediency. We chose, for example, to submit to the Islamic Turkish yoke rather than compromise our faith by submission to the Pope. Had we compromised at this or any other time, there would now be not much left of Orthodoxy as a witness to the apostolic faith which alone can reunite Christendom. We are duty-bound to God and our Fathers to avoid the sentimentalism of those who foolishly say that we must give and take for the sake of Christian unity, or for the sake of preventing Islam or atheism from swallowing up the Church. We have a responsibility to witness to the true faith regardless of the consequences.

I would like to again express my doubts about Dioscoros' complete faithfulness to Cyril since all indications point to his rejection of Cyril's reconciliatory acts of 433. Also at Chalcedon several witnesses testified that Dioscoros expelled certain people from positions in the Church of Alexandria solely because they were either friends or relatives of St. Cyril. Of course Dioscoros' Orthodoxy and faithfulness to Alexandrian terminology cannot be questioned. But Alexandrian terminology cannot be isolated from the rest of the Church, as clearly demonstrated by St. Cyril himself in 433.

ABBA HABTEMARIAM: The spirit of polemics has led Christians in the past to denounce each other as heretics and unbelievers. It is a fact that

these polemics have not helped the Church to be itself. We must now change from the spirit of polemics to the spirit of unity.

FATHER ROMANIDES: The Oriental Orthodox are perhaps not very familiar with the place of St. Cyril's Twelve Chapters in the Council of Chalcedon (451) and Constantinople (553). It must be emphasized once more that the Council of 553 anathematizes those who do not accept the Twelve Chapters of St. Cyril. Also it must be realized that, according to the minutes and the definition of the Council of Chalcedon, the Tome of Leo was accepted only in the light of and subordinate to the Twelve Chapters of St. Cyril. Whereas the Twelve Chapters of St. Cyril were accepted as the definition and criterion of faith at Ephesus (431), Chalcedon (451) and Constantinople (553), the Tome of Leo does not enjoy the same or equal reputation and can be accepted only in the light of St. Cyril.

PROFESSOR KONIDARIS: The confusion of terminology is derived from the dispute between the two Dionysii (mid 3rd century). The Latin term *substantia* included two possible meanings, rendered in Greek by the terms *hypostasis (prosopon)*, *ousia*, *physis*. In the East the term *hypostasis* has been the prevailing one (with the Cappadocians) denoting the unity of the Person of the Lord in the Trinity), as well as of the historical Christ. Because Apollinaris put forward the problem of the relationship between the two natures in Christ by speaking in terms of the dichotomy of human nature (Neoplatonic theory), automatically the question was raised concerning the fullness of the human nature. Between the two Ecumenical Councils of 431 and 451 the problem of using the appropriate terms was clarified. That is why the Fourth Ecumenical Council does not use the term *physis* (which could create confusion) but *hypostasis* and *prosopon*. The use of the dative case expresses a characteristic of the teaching of the Catholic Orthodox Church against the Monophysites and against the Tome of Leo. The hypostasis of the Divine assumed full and perfect human nature. This teaching was interpreted in a right way by Leontios Byzantios in the sixth century, using the neo-platonic term "*enhypostasis*." Thus the full and perfect human nature "*enhypostatos*," without having an independent existence, has its own existence in the *hypostasis* of the Divine Logos. The return to the confusion about the terms *physis* and *prosopon* after 532 A.D. is due to the policy of the Emperors (for instance Justinian) and of other circles in their efforts to face the false accusations against the Fourth Ecumenical Council of "Nestorianizing." The clarity of the decisions of the Fourth Ecumenical Council has to be explained precisely by the use of the appropriate terms after the death of Cyril (444). It used both terms in the way that my colleague Professor Karmiris has done. Thus the Duophysitism of Nestorius and the Monophysitism of Eutyches were both rejected and defeated.

August 14th, 1964, Evening Session

A STATEMENT MADE BY HIS GRACE MAR THOMA DIONYSIUS

I stand here, not as an active participant in the deliberations of the week, nor as a specialist in matters of modern scholarship in Patristic Theology. I thank God for bringing us together for this consultation, which, let us hope, will lead to the healing of our age-long breach in the Church, the Body of Christ our Lord. Our gratitude goes to the World Council of Churches for their Christian goodwill in making this consultation possible.

I have been listening with deep interest to the various sincere and open discussions and clarifications of the issues involved in the breach during the week. I have no hesitation in stating optimistically that God's Holy Spirit has been guiding us all along the right path towards the goal of unity and peace in the Orthodox Church.

In regard to the division of the Chalcedonian and the non-Chalcedonian bodies, which has been the subject of our discussion here, I must admit, I belong to neither of them. From my own personal point of view, I hold to the ancient Orthodox faith. From one aspect of the matter, I should consider myself pro-Chalcedonian. But from another aspect I have to assume the opposite stand.

The point I make is this. On more than one occasion I had to pronounce anathema against Eutyches, I mean at our ordinations and consecrations. Having done this publicly and traditionally on several occasions, I am convinced of the seriousness of Eutyches' heresy.

Like the other heresies of the Church, such as Arius, Macedonius and Nestorius, Eutyches ignored the supreme fact that matters relating to our Lord, especially his *Qnomo* (personality), his *Kyono* (nature) and his Will are divine mysteries. These heretics were no doubt thinkers and one of them, Nestorius, was the Patriarch of Constantinople. But their failure was due to their reliance on their own intellectual ability. They failed to realize that a Heavenly Mystery is always beyond the scope of comprehension by mere human intellect; and consequently, they

stood by their own individual conclusions. St. Augustine in his ignorance of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity was saved by divine revelation and not by his personal thinking.

Now, Eutyches by his teaching declared that the human nature of our Lord was confronted with His Divine Nature and eventually was destroyed in that confusion. He was reported to have said that our Lord's Divine Nature was like a vast ocean and the Human Nature was only like a drop of honey which was lost in the vast ocean of water. Again some said that he compared Christ's Human Nature to a drop of cold water on a piece of red-hot iron. All this may or may not have been truly said by him. Eutyches became conspicuous and popular by his teaching. This was nothing less than cutting at the roots of our Lord's incarnate union of Godhood and Manhood. He had believed that the Son of God, the Word, came down and took flesh from the Virgin Mary; but his fall from the fundamental truth of the Incarnation was the cause of his teaching being anathematized.

Arius taught that Christ our Lord was not God but only a creation of God. The Council of Nicea condemned him. *Macedonius* taught that the Holy Ghost was not God. The Synod of Constantinople anathematized him. *Nestorius* declared that our Lord was born as a human baby, not as God; that His humanity and His divinity were two parallel distinct persons in Christ. The Holy Orthodox Church taught that Christ was born as God and died as God. Hence the Blessed Virgin Mary was declared the Mother of God.

Eutyches, who was the head of a large monastery in Constantinople, opposed Nestorius and wanted to confirm Christ's one person and he had the support of some of the Fathers in his true faith and teaching. But apparently his enthusiasm for the oneness of Christ's personality deteriorated into the heterodox and heretical view of the oneness of Christ's divine nature devoid of His human nature. He ignored the fact that:

1. Our Lord was born and grew and lived and worked as man;
2. Our Lord called Himself the *Son of Man*;
3. At His baptism, God the Father proclaimed Him *Beloved Son*;
4. At Transfiguration the same heavenly proclamation asked us to *accept Him as such*;
5. In Gethsemane He was grieved and prayed as man;
6. He suffered and cried on the cross likewise;

7. He rose and ascended in His human body;
8. His Blood is interceding in Heaven for us. It is the Blood of His human body;
9. We are looking forward for the second coming of the Lord in His human body.

Eutyches fell from these truths. Hence the Church of God pronounced anathema on his teaching and will continue to do so.

Now there is another aspect of Chalcedon for our consideration: the two things, one nature and two natures in Christ, have been disturbing God's Church, particularly the Orthodox Church in India. The Western church in some places holds to the two natures and condemns the Oriental non-Chalcedonian church as monophysite. This situation we oppose as unfair to the *purpose of God*. Since the fall of Adam, God and man became aliens. In reconciliation between God and man, God the Father sent to the world the Redeemer, His only begotten Son.

The act of redemption was the atonement (at-one-ment) — God one with man — God-man — man one with God — Man-God. Christ by the process of atonement is both God-man and Man-God. Divinity and humanity have been joined in one. Union of Human and Divine Nature have become one united nature. Those who teach two persons in Christ and those who believe two separate natures after the mysterious union in Christ, we say, are not orthodox, but heterodox.

UNION OF NATURES IN ORTHODOX VIEW

Our Lord has had His divine nature and human nature in their own properties without confusion or mixture joined together hypostatically, never to be separated as two natures after the union. This is the Church's teaching. It is ignorance and unfairness on the part of those who stigmatize the Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian as Nestorian and Monophysite. Now both of the branches of the church have, by the great mercy of God, come to a better understanding and clearer interpretation and are orthodox in the true sense of the word.

What next? For a lasting connection or communion between the two sections, the following may be helpful:

1. Closer and frequent contact between the churches through visits of their heads and theologians and priests;
2. Exchanging theological literature and taking an active part

in common worship, each church faithfully maintaining its own national and traditional characteristics, customs, rules, etc.;

3. Enlarged study of literature in Greek, Russian, Syrian, Arabic and other languages wherever possible;
4. Preparation of a missionary scheme and training of more members for the mission field in the country and outside;
5. Regular prayers of intercession for the churches.

I beg your prayers for the distant church of India, so that God may prosper it, its priests and its people. Let us all be one Holy Catholic Orthodox Church — one Christian East.

THE AGREED STATEMENT

August 14th, 1964, Afternoon and Evening Sessions.

The Agreed Statement (page 14) was composed, discussed and agreed upon.

August 15th, 1964

On Saturday, the 15th of August, on the Feast of the Dormition of the Blessed Virgin Theotokos, Divine Liturgy was celebrated in the Crypt (dedicated to St. Nicholas) of the ancient Church of St. Mary in Aarhus by the Chalcedonian Orthodox and thus the Consultation was concluded.

The sessions were chaired alternately by Bishop Emilianos, Metropolitan Dionysius, Archbishop Tiran, and Bishop Sarkissian.

The meetings were opened in the morning and concluded in the evening with prayers of the various traditions.

APPENDIX

THE DOCTRINE OF THE UNION OF THE TWO NATURES IN CHRIST

A THEOLOGICAL VIEW

By ARCHBISHOP MAR SEVERIUS ZAKKA IWAS OF MOSUL

The Churches which teach the two natures of Christ are confessing in theory the unity of those two natures. In practice they distinguish between the two natures, because they ascribe certain actions to the humanity of Christ and others to His divinity. As Leo wrote in his Tome: "Christ really has two natures, He is both God and man; the one performs miracles, and the other accepts suffering." One author wrote: "Our Church confesses that everything which is characteristic of the Godhead and everything which is characteristic of man is to be ascribed without distinction to the incarnate Word; in this dogma it (the Church) has proofs from Holy Scripture, both logical and historical, and the testimony of others."

The same author asks: "What is nature and what is kenoma (person), and what is meant by economic natural union?"

The philosophers defined nature as follows: Nature is the designation of the "What" of things (i.e. their essence and their object). If we speak in this way of the nature of God, then we mean God Himself. But the kenoma (person) is a designation of the origin (Entstehung) of the thing itself. In other words: the kenoma is a spiritual essence, personal in nature, conceivable as associated with many others. This means that it is the kenoma which distinguishes persons from each other. The kenoma distinguishes Peter from Paul, and Paul from John.

The theologian Mar Gregorius Mar-Hebraeus says in his theological encyclopedia: "Ecclesiastics or theologians agree with us; every essence is a nature, and a nature is an essence, for in our opinion nature is not perceptible through the symptoms, but the symptoms arise from the nature. The heretics, however, say that every being is a nature, but that every nature is not a being. For the symptoms themselves differ from one another in their nature. And nature (according to our view, and to that of the heretics) is either a general or a special one. The special nature is therefore called kenoma. For it is impossible for a nature to

exist without kenoma, merely in existence. But it is not impossible for many kenomas to exist in a general nature, within which they are placed together."

Bishop Isidorus says: "Nature, in analogy to the abstract creation, or to the concrete one, generalizes and specializes. When it generalizes, it includes all the individual examples of the same type, e.g. Peter, Paul and John are all men, the horse, the lion, the donkey and the cat are all animals, and Michael and Gabriel are both spirits. On the other hand, when it specializes it consists only of one example of the type, e.g. Peter as one example of a man, the horse as one example of an animal, and Michael as one example of the abstract."

Another writer says: "Where being exists, there exist with it also the special and the general. In the case of the special, the being includes only one kenoma; in the case of the general, the being included many kenomas (persons)."

The same writer says: "The self (person) or nature or being in the special case is the kenoma, or person. It is therefore impossible for being, or nature or self, to exist without kenoma, except in the sphere of ratio."

WHAT DOES "UNION" MEAN?

Generally speaking, union is the merging of two or more things into one. But in theology "union" is the combination (without alteration in nature) of beings, which are united without any change or modification occurring in their own nature. The union between the soul and the body does not lead to any fusion or mixing, like the union of fire with iron, or of electricity with the filament of the light-bulb.

Both the soul and the body retain their own nature when they are united. For example, if the soul had become flesh, then it would lose the ability to speak and to think rationally and all the other functions which are characteristic of it, it would become like an animal and when it died it would become dust. And if the body had become a soul, then it would not need to eat or drink. But as it is, each retains its own quality.

In its union with the material body the abstract soul exercised its influence on the flesh, but was not influenced by it; the soul imparts its life to the body and raises it above the nature of the animals, by giving man "ratio" and speech. For man consists of

two essences or beings: one animal and earthly, the other heavenly. In man they become united in one existence, one essence or being. Everything that happens to one part of this single existence (which is composed of two parts) happens to the whole; although some of these occurrences are experienced only by the soul and others only by the body, i.e. only by one of the parts of which the whole existence is composed. But because man is a composite being made up by union of two parts, then everything that happens to one part affects the whole and all the parts. So we can say, for instance, that John ate or drank or slept, or that Salim was an architect or a lawyer or was dead or alive.

St. Cyril of Alexandria said: "As an example of the union of the Godhead with humanity let us take the union of fire with iron. Although their natures are different, through their union they become one nature. Not because the nature of the fire is changed and become iron; nor because the nature of the iron is changed and become fire. But fire is united with iron. It is fire and it is iron . . . if the iron is struck, then the fire is struck also. The iron suffers, but the fire does not suffer."

Also in this letter to the Bishop of Caesarea, he said: "Let us take an example from our own human nature. Because we are created of soul and body, and they are not two separate natures before their union, and with their union they become a man with a nature, the soul is not changed in its nature because of its union with the flesh. The soul has not become flesh, and the flesh has not become soul; but the soul and the flesh together have become one nature and one man."

So we understand the union of humanity and divinity in the one Christ, as the Bible says and the Holy Fathers taught, and as pure reason can understand and believe. And it is impossible that we speak of two natures after their union. For after the union of the Godhead with humanity, the duality between the two natures ceased to exist. Just as in the union between the soul and the flesh in a man, after the union mention was made not of a speaking soul but of a speaking animal. And we find no clearer example than those we have just mentioned, in order to explain the union of the abstract Word with concrete manhood. For after the union we do not speak of the man and of God, nor of God and of man, but of the man-God or of the God-man, and of the Biblical expression "the incarnate Word" or "the Word become Man."

THE MYSTERY OF THE INCARNATION

By THE VERY REV. LIKE SULTANAT HABTE MARIAM WORQUINEH

The question of how the divine and the human natures are united in Christ has been a stumbling-block to some churches. But the fact is that the Incarnation, namely that God the Son united to Himself manhood, is indeed a divine mystery. It is clear that the two natures of Godhead and manhood are perfectly united and that Christ is thus one Person and one Nature from two Natures.

The one holy, catholic and apostolic Church had, from the beginning, held to this great mystery concerning the Incarnation. But from the fourth century there arose heretics who tried to spread erroneous ideas. Some, for instance, maintained that Christ was only human. Others taught the other extreme and denied His humanity. Apollinarius affirmed that He had no human soul. There were also others who insisted on the unity of His Person, but divided His Natures. Some others, while affirming the union of the two Natures and even granting His Nature to be one, spoke of two Natures. There were also men like Eutyches for whom one of the two Natures was lost in the other.

The holy Church, while keeping to the orthodox faith, anathematized the heretics. But unfortunately the Council of Chalcedon in 451 became the cause of division of the one Church into two, the reason being political rather than dogmatic. There was in fact a question of dogma involved in that division, but it was not really fundamental, and the parties could have come to an agreement by accepting the teaching of St. Cyril of Alexandria, our common father, who had maintained that Christ was "One incarnate nature of God the Word." In opposing Nestorius and his followers St. Cyril had shown that it was impossible to speak of Christ that He was in two natures after the union. The famous teaching of the Evangelist John that "the Word became flesh" (John 1:14) signified the divine mystery of the union and the unity of Christ's Person and Nature. By the union of the natures in the Incarnation, the two natures became one nature, the natures being united without separation, without confusion, and without change. Thus He was perfect God and perfect man. While testifying to this mystery, St. Peter says, He "died in the

flesh, but was quickened by the spirit" (1 Peter 3:18). This shows that neither of the two natures was assimilated by the other, but that the properties of the Divine Word were attributed to the flesh and those of the flesh to the Divine Word.

However, this division of the Church has been overemphasized in Christian literature and thus many have been fighting each other in words accusing one another of heresy. When the two parties got together in a synod nothing good was settled by the synod except for some disturbance and this is shown by the minutes and the decisions of the synod. But it is clear from the minutes of Chalcedon that St. Dioscorus was not anathematized on the ground of heresy. From our side also there were some who called the synod a council of dogs (Abba Giorgis) and rejected it. The main reason for this division of the church was political. Besides, there was great misunderstanding between the two groups in regard to the philosophical terminologies such as hypostasis, physis and ousia, which had caused disputes between the two schools of Alexandria and Antioch.

There have been in our country (Ethiopia) two types of heretics who, without understanding deeply the mystery of the Incarnation, have denied the perfect union of the two natures, in Christ, and the truth that He is perfect man and perfect God. In fact, these heretics have their origin in the heresies of the 3rd and 4th centuries. They are (1) *Tsegga*, (*The Adoptionist or the "Son of Grace" view*). They teach that Christ is not by nature the Son of God. But He is God or the Son of God only by the Grace of God or by adoption. Until His baptism Jesus was an ordinary man. At his baptism, He received the gift of God and thus He became the Son of God only by grace. These heretics had gathered many followers and caused great troubles in the country. (2) *Kibat* (*The Sons of the Chrism*). These have the same teaching as those mentioned above. A Prince is anointed to become king or a prophet in the O.T. for one can be anointed to receive the gift of prophecy. In the same way Christ became God or the Son of God by the anointing (gift) of the Holy Spirit. That is why He was called "Christ," the "Kibu" (the anointed). These two groups of adoptionists spread their teachings in many parts of the country. Thus the one church of Ethiopia was divided into three groups who fought each other for a long time during the 16th century. But eventually truth became the winner and

thus the ancient and official orthodox faith was strengthened (MEDBELE HAIMANOT).

These two groups who taught that Christ was only man had their origin in the heresies of the 2nd and 3rd centuries. However, if they look carefully over the Holy Scriptures, they would be sure of the divinity of Christ. St. Paul speaks of Him as follows: ". . . who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God. But made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the likeness of man" (Phil. 2:6-7). St. John also, speaking of His divinity says: "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." He says also: "The Word was made flesh" by which he testifies to the mystery of Incarnation. The Ethiopian Orthodox Fathers, based upon the Holy Scriptures, have preserved for us the right teaching of the true faith.

The Ethiopian Orthodox Church accepts the two natures united (in union) and thus, in order to distinguish her from the above-mentioned heretics, it took for herself a distinctive name (The Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahido bete-Christian) i.e. The Ethiopian Orthodox Union Church, that is to say, the church which accepts the perfect union of the two natures in Christ and which believes that Christ is perfect man and perfect God.

THE TEACHING OF THE ETHIOPIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH ABOUT ONE NATURE

The Second of the three divine Persons is God the Son. Since God the Son is the only-begotten Son of the Father, He is called the Son of God (Heb. ch. 1), and as He is the Father's word He is called the Word of God (John 1/1-14). He is called Jesus because He is the saviour. As He is the anointed king or Messiah He is called Christ. Taking our nature and carrying our judgment on Himself, He saved us maintaining for ever His union with us. Therefore He is called Emmanuel (Ias. 7:14). He is the Creator of our body and soul. He is our master who delivered us from the bondage to the Devil, and thus He is called Lord. Likewise He has many other attributes which befit His natures, essence and work. God the Son as Person is sent of God, His specific name is Son and as such He is begotten. The Son is born of the Father before the creation of the world; that is, He is born of the same person and the same substance of the Father. Begotten

not made, He is perfect God, coequal and consubstantial with the Father in His Divinity. Through Him came all things into being. Nothing was made without Him (Creed of the Apostle John 1:3. 1 Cor. 1:30). St. Paul also testifies to the divinity of the Son as follows: "Now unto the king eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen" (1 Tim. 1:17). He (the Son) is Light from Light, Very God from Very God. He is the first, none is prior and superior to Him. He is the first and the last. He is alpha and omega.

When the fulness of the time came, He revealed Himself in our flesh and became man like us. He did all things that man does with the exception of sin (John 8:46. 11 Cor. 5:21). And at the same time He was with the Father and the Holy Spirit, and did not abandon His throne because He was truly God. As absolutely true man He walked on the earth with us and accomplished all the works of man, and by this His humanity was shown. Christ means the anointed (Messiah). In Him Godhood and manhood, referred to as two natures, are united without separation, without confusion and without change and become one. The name "Christ" is the designation of this perfect union of the two natures, and is not only of the human or only of the divine. By this perfect union Christ became one person instead of two persons and one nature instead of two natures. So He is perfect man and perfect God. He is always praised as the Son of God and as the Son of man, or as God-man. In His incarnation the Son of God was not separated from His Father and from the Holy Spirit, but was ever with them. The Son of God is the true way of life, and through Him the believers are restored from death to life.

Therefore, we believe that Jesus Christ, our Lord, is true God from true God, begotten from the Father before the creation of the world. For us and for our salvation He became incarnate and was perfect man. He took the human nature fully without any addition or any subtraction. As He was begotten from His Father, He is perfect God and is co-equal and consubstantial with the Father in His Godhead. No imperfection is found in His humanity. He is perfect man like us. He is perfectly united with us, the union being from the two natures into one nature and from two modes of life into one. This union took place without any change, confusion and division. This happened through the divine power and mystery. After the union of the divine and

human natures we do not speak of the two persons nor of the two natures, but of one person, one nature and one will. So we worship one Lord, one God and one Jesus with His Father and the Holy Spirit (creed). The union of the Divine Word with the flesh took place in the womb of the Virgin Mary. The Divine person with the human person on the one hand, and the Divine nature with the human nature on the other hand were united perfectly. This is testified by St. Cyril as follows: "We believe in the incarnate Word revealed in one nature."

The union which took place in the womb is a perfect union. And this St. John has testified saying: "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." In the same way, we can say that flesh also was made divine. Thus the attributes of the flesh can be given to the Divine Word and vice versa. However, the properties of each nature are preserved without any change after the union. Therefore, we believe that Christ is one person and one nature, and this is both divine and human. We speak of one because of the union. That is to say, the human person and the human nature being united with the divine person and divine nature, became one person and one nature. We strongly anathematize those who say that Christ's humanity was absorbed or swallowed up in His Divinity and thus Christ has only one person and one nature. But we say that the two natures are united without change.

The mystery of the union of humanity and divinity or the mystery of one nature and one person was shown in many soteriological works of Christ. Christ, in whom humanity and divinity were united in one person and one nature, was crucified on the cross. The Divine Word without being united with the flesh cannot be crucified, because as God He is beyond suffering. But through the union with the flesh He was crucified and was subjected to death. If, on the other hand, only the human body was crucified He could not save the world. Many were crucified, but it is only Christ who has saved the world. What wonder if Christ was crucified and died in the flesh! "While thou wast nailed on the cross, Thou didst not depart from Thy throne and didst not separate from Thy Father and Thy Holy Spirit" said St. Heracles. When we speak of Christ crucified we have to believe that both His humanity and divinity were present on the cross, because as we said above, the Logos unless united with the flesh cannot be crucified, and the flesh, without being united with the Divine

Logos, could not save the world. "Thou art in heaven with the Father and at the same time Thou art on the cross crucified. Thou who dost not suffer in Spirit (Divinity) hast suffered in flesh." The Deity, who does not suffer, had suffered on the cross because of His union with the flesh. When the weak and mortal flesh was crucified it could give salvation to the world because of its union with the immortal Deity. Death is the property (attribute) of humanity and life is that of the Deity (Divinity), but through the union the property of the flesh is given to the Divine Word and vice versa. Thus we say: He who does not die died on the cross. St. Peter also speaking of the mystery of the union says: "[Christ] died in the flesh but was quickened by the Spirit." He who "died" is the divine Word which is united with the immortal Divine Word. St. Paul explained this saying: "We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son" (Romans 5:10).

When Christ died, as He was perfect man, He separated His blessed soul from His body by His own power. However, His divinity was in the grave with the flesh and also in Hades with His soul. It is only His soul that separated from His flesh, but His divinity was with both His flesh and soul. Divinity never separates from the flesh and flesh also never separates from the Divinity. It will be wherever the Divinity will be. Because of the perfect union both were subject to death. Philalethes has explained this as follows: "When the soul separated from the flesh, Divinity did not separate either from flesh or soul (which is separated from flesh)."

When the Son of God was in the grave in the flesh at the same time that flesh united with the Divinity was ruling the world sitting at the right hand of God the Father. "Thou stayed in the grave while Thou wast upon the Cherubim. Thou wast dead for three days while Thou wast living with the Father and the Holy Spirit."

THE WAY TO UNITY

It is necessary that all of us who believe in Christ should have the same teaching and walk on the same road. We can speak of one Christ, one Church and one Baptism only when we follow the same principle and are united in holding to the same confession. Otherwise we divide the one and indivisible Christ and the one universal Church into many sects. And thus we give occasion for non-Christians to criticize severely the Christian Church and its principles. Even during the time of the Apostles there

was division among the believers, though they did not have any dogmatic differences. Some claimed to be of Paul, some of Cephas and some of Apollos. St. Paul, the teacher of the Gentiles, had rightly condemned this tendency and said: "Is Christ Divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Why such a division? . . ." If we now believe that Christ is perfect man and perfect God, and that He is our only Saviour, we hold the fundamental truth of the Christian faith and all other notions are nothing but a cause for division. When we say that Christ is one nature, we do not mean that either of the two natures is assimilated by the other, but we say one nature only to stress the perfect union of the two natures and to condemn the Nestorian heresy of dividing the one Christ into two natures. Those also who believe that Christ is in two natures do accept and believe the perfect union of the two natures. In this case the difference is only in words, not in essence, because we all believe in the perfect union. Christ is one *hypostasis* and one nature because of the union, and thus He is perfect man and perfect God. Because of the union with the flesh, His divinity was the subject of all the human works. Because of its union with the divine nature, the flesh was the subject of all the divine works.

If this emphasis is accepted, there is no place for division. The two natures can never be separated but they are eternally united and we believe in this perfect union. Whatever Christ worked was the work of both natures in union. Neither the flesh nor the divine Word acts separately, i.e. it is wrong to say the former performs only human acts and that the latter only what is divine. We do not say that flesh works only the works of the flesh and that the divine Word works only the works of the Word. In other words, we do not speak of two natures or energies after the union, but we say that Christ is one, God and man at the same time.

However, fundamentally we have the same teaching and the same belief, and therefore, we should not thus remain separated from each other only because of some complicated philosophical terms and conceptions. We are anxiously looking forward to the time when all churches would become one affirming the same faith. Those who work hard for the union of the churches are worthy of praise. Nowadays we need as many people as possible to labor for the rediscovery of the Church's ever-existing unity. It is our sincere wish and prayer that all the leaders of the Churches would work hard for the realization of Church Unity.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.